DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 099 010 JC 740 450

TITLE	Papers from the Community College Governance Conference, February 15-16, 1974.
INSTITUTION	Washington State Board for Community Coll. Education, Olympia.
PUB DATE	3 Jul 74
NOTE	62p.; Papers presented at Community College Governance Conference (Seattle, Washington, February 1974)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$3.15 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*College Administration; College Faculty; College Students; *Community Colleges; Conference Reports; *Governance; Post Secondary Education; Speeches; *Student Participation; *Teacher Participation

ABSTRACT

Papers presented at a conference on community college governance, held in Seattle, Washington on February 15-16, 1974, are provided. The papers are: "Governance for the Two-Year College" by Richard C. Richardson, Jr.: "The Faculty Stake in Governance" by Richard J. Frankie; "The Student Stake in Governance" by Alan R. Shark; "The Public Interest and Governance" by W. Joseph Shoemaker; "The Administrators Speak" by Kenneth Aldrich; "The Faculty Speaks" by Helen Simon; "The Presidents Speak" by Robert Hamill; "The Students Speak" by John Postan; "The Trustees Speak" by Harriet Jaquette and Betty Mage; "Summary" by Frederic T. Giles; "Reflections" by Richard C. Richardson, Jr., Richard J. Frankie, Alan R. Shark, and W. Joseph Shoemaker; and "Closing Remarks" by John C. Mundt. (DB)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Papers from the

Community College Governance Conference

February 15-16, 1974

ED 099010

STATE OF WASHINGTON

STATE BOARD FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE EDUCATION

JC 740 450

STATE OF WASHINGTON

STATE BOARD FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE EDUCATION

319 Seventh Avenue
Olympia, Washington 98504
Telephone: (206) 753-2000

July 3, 1974

The attached volume contains much of the content of the Community College Governance Conference held in Seattle on February 15-16, 1974.

At first glance it appeared a forbidding volume, but as I began to read through it, I realized again how much of value to all of us was said during the two days we wrestled with the various questions of community college governance. I recommend it to your careful review.

At the June 25 study session between representatives of the State Board for Community College Education and the Faculty Association of Community Colleges, the FACC representatives urged the Board to take leadership in recommending campus governance structures which provide all constituents with an appropriate share in decision-making.

The Board cannot, of course, impose governance structures on colleges as that matter is the prerogative of the local boards. Also we are not convinced that any one governance structure can serve the needs of every campus.

Perhaps the key point in the Governance Conference papers is that there are many governance models and many possible combinations of them and that different approaches may be appropriate for differing times and circumstances.

There are deep concerns on behalf of many individuals and organizations regarding the present state of governance in the Washington community college system and the Board does urge every district to examine its existing procedures and explore with each constituent group in the campus family the merits of alternative approaches.

Currently, a task force representing state and local board members is making an examination of the relative roles of the State Board and district trustees.

In my closing remarks to the Governance Conference, I expressed the hope that a consensus would develop from within the system on what kind of follow-up is appropriate. Since the Governance Conference, several districts have undertaken district-level follow-up activities regarding governance procedures. The results so far are encouraging, and I hope every district will undertake similar activities this year.

Again, let me recommend to you the reading of this report. I think you will find it provides a great deal of insight into the subject of governance.

John C. Mundt
State Director

CONTENTS

		PAGE
KEYNOTE SPEAKERS		
Governance for the Two-Year College	Richard C. Richardson, Jr.	1
The Faculty Stake in Governance	Richard J. Frankie	8
The Student Stake in Governance	Alan R. Shark	15
The Public Interest and Governance	W. Joseph Shoemaker	24
THE CONSTITUENCIES SPEAK		
Administrators	Kenneth Aldrich	30
Faculty	Helen Simon	32
Presidents	Robert Hamill	33
Students	John Postan	35
Trustees	Harriet Jaquette Betty Mage	37
Summary	Frederic T. Giles	39
REFLECTIONS		
	Richard C. Richardson, Jr.	43
	Richard J. Frankie	45
	Alan R. Shark	47
	W. Joseph Shoemaker	50
CLOSING REMARKS		
	John C. Mundt	53

THE GOVERNANCE CONFERENCE

Who Shall Govern? The question assumes increasingly greater importance in the nation's institutions of higher education each year. Where once the president and the board clearly "ran" the institution, autocracy has begun to give way to demands for participatory forms of institutional management from faculty, students and public representatives. Yet no recognized formula, no structure, no model which meets the requirements for institutional management while accommodating the demands of the constituent groups for participation has emerged to replace the old autocratic methods of governance.

In the belief that an opportunity was needed to examine the governance problem in a comprehensive manner, away from the heat of negotiations and the press of everyday concerns, John C. Mundt, state director, asked representatives of community college faculty, students, administrators, trustees and the State Board for Community College Education to participate in a workshop on community college governance on February 15 and 16, 1974.

Invited speakers were:

Dr. Richard C. Richardson, Jr., President of Northampton County Area (Penna.) Community College and author of two books and many articles on governance.

Mr. Alan R. Shark, Chairman of the City University of New York Student Senate and a graduate student in business and public administration at Baruch College.

Professor Richard J. Frankie, Associate Professor of Higher Education at George Washington University, specializing in community colleges, and the author of papers and articles on collective bargaining and governance.

Senator W. Joseph Shoemaker, Chairman of the Joint Budget Committee of the Colorado State Legislature and a Denver attorney.

Dr. Frederic T. Giles, Professor and Dean of Education, University of Washington, and former president of Everett Community College.

This report includes two presentations by each of the four invited speakers, reports from meetings of each of the constituent groups and a summary of the latter by Dean Giles, and closing remarks by Mr. Mundt.

Keynote Speakers

Governance for the Two-Year College - Richard C. Richardson, Jr.

The Faculty Stake in Governance - Richard J. Frankie

The Student Stake in Governance - Alan R. Shark

The Public Interest and Governance - W. Joseph Shoemaker

GOVERNANCE FOR THE TWO YEAR COLLEGE

by Richard C. Richardson, Jr.
Northampton County Area Community College
Bethlehem, PA

There is much to be learned during periods of upheaval. Whatever the cost in terms of shibboliths and administrative anguish, our knowledge of governance practices has advanced significantly as a result of the challenges of the last decade. A brief nine years ago, George Hall, then Director of the Midwest Community College Leadership Program, could observe that our colleges lacked sufficient faculty involvement in the decision making process.[1] Today colleges in a growing number of states are confronting the reality of collective bargaining and the limits on board and administrative discretion which seem to follow. In between, we have survived a period of student activism which, while mild in comparison with some four year colleges and universities, was nonetheless, a profound experience for a number of community colleges and a significant influence on us all.

Our discussion of the topic of governance will be aided by a common understanding of terms. Administrative structure refers to the formal organization of a college. The governance structure involves committees, councils, senates and other bodies on which there is participation by more than a single constituency. Participative administration describes the behavior of administrators in situations where learned behavioral science skills are used to improve communications, motivation, decision making, goal definition and goal attainment. Participative administration is effective administration. It does not require the presence of specific governance structures nor does it rely upon the absence of a faculty union. Indeed, the presence of collective bargaining may increase the need for administrators to understand and practice behaviors.

Participative governance by contrast involves joint committees or other structures through which faculty, administrators and increasingly students contribute to the decision making process for the college. Participative governance to function effectively requires administrators who understand and practice the techniques of participative administration. Opinion is divided on whether an institution organized for collective bargaining can continue to practice participative governance. If the college had effective joint committees or councils prior to the decision to organize, such structures may survive in limited areas of responsibility. Institutions which lack a governance structure at the time they are organized for collective bargaining are unlikely to develop one until several contracts have been negotiated. The lack of governance structures for involving faculty in institutional decision making is frequently cited as a significant factor in the decision of a faculty to organize.

---

[1]George L. Hall, "Report on Faculty Organization Study", (Report given at Wayne State University Conference, January 23, 1965), Charles Alexander, Editor.

There is an old story about the agricultural extension agent who approached a farmer and began to tell him about all of the latest theories on increasing crop yield. After a few minutes the farmer interrupted him saying, "Hold on there young fellow, I already know more about farming than I'm using." The story points to one of our problems. Most of us have read books and articles which have offered extensive advice on how to improve our administrative practices. What we need is a way of making sense out of what we know and of applying it so we don't spend an excessive amount of time in coping with complex procedures which provide marginal or non-existent returns.

Institutions are complex phenomenon. In order to make them understandable in human terms we construct models intended to reduce the number of variables with which trustees, administrators, faculty and students have to work to carry out their responsibilities. Many practical board members and administrators tend to underestimate the importance of models and the theories on which they are based. It has been observed that human behavior is a self-fulfilling prophecy; that is, we tend to become what we think we are. If we visualize our institutions as educational supermarkets and our students as customers choosing courses off the shelf, this view will influence our values, our behavior and our architecture.

There are three major models which currently compete for our attention in explaining why our colleges appear as they do. The first and best developed of these is the bureaucratic model.[2] Perhaps as recently as five years ago, few administrators would have questioned the capability of this model to explain the dynamics of our institutions. The bureaucratic model views a college as a formal structure with defined patterns of activity related to the functions spelled out in law and in policy decisions. The structure consists of a series of positions arranged in the shape of a pyramid with each position having specified responsibilities, privileges, and competencies.

The organization is held together by authority which is delegated downward from the board of trustees and used by each level in the pyramid to control the actions of those at lower levels. Faculty and students occupy the lowest levels of the pyramid. The system of rewards is managed to provide greater benefits to those at higher levels in the organization than at lower levels.

Student activism and collective bargaining have forced us to take another look at the assumptions of the bureaucratic model. As educators, we have always been somewhat uncomfortable with this model as evidenced by our statements about the importance of students even when our actions have indicated we don't really believe in their importance except when we can do so without inconveniencing those at higher levels in the pyramid. Of course some of us have tried to change our organizations by drawing the pyramid upside down or by changing its shape to a circle. Exercises in the geometry of organizational charts do not, however, change values or attitudes so staff members have adapted to these innovations by behaving in the same ways as they always have. After all, each of us has been reared in a highly bureaucratic society and we know the shape of social arrangements and who fits where regardless of any Madison Avenue efforts to make us believe that up is really down.

---

[2] Robert K. Merton, *Social Theory and Social Structure*, The Free Press of Glencoe, Ill., 1963, p. 195.

So the bureaucratic model is still very much alive and constitutes the dominant influence in most community colleges. Such new approaches to accountability as Planning, Programming, Budgeting Systems (PPBS) are clearly based on bureaucratic assumptions relative to the extent to which every action in an organization can be shaped to pre-determined goals and the extent to which controls administered from the top down can improve efficiency. And it must be added that this state of affairs is by no means undesirable. The administrative structures of our colleges reflect bureaucratic assumptions and for that reason are quite efficient in carrying out coordinating responsibilities. Developing and administering a budget, scheduling classes, operating and maintaining a physical plant and similar responsibilities require above all effective coordination. Delegating such responsibilities to other than a competent administrative staff can only lead to incredible confusion and frustration.

The second model currently available as a way of describing how our colleges function relies upon the concept of shared authority.[3] Collegium, joint participation or participative governance are all terms for governance arrangements based on shared authority. The structure of governance for a shared authority model includes joint committees and an all college forum or senate. While an administrative structure is also present in the shared authority model, the importance of administrators is not nearly so evident. Status symbols such as special parking and depth of carpeting and exotic plants in the office tend to be subdued in the interests of improving communication and reducing hostility. Students, faculty and administrators may be on a first name basis and informality in general is the order of the day. Faculty and students, instead of being at the bottom of a pyramid are part of a community composed of equal partners. Authority is not delegated downward as in the bureaucratic model; rather trustees share their authority with students and faculty as well as with administrators. Students and faculty communicate directly with the board rather than through the president with ground rules keeping the interaction manageable.

Like its bureaucatic counterpart, the participative governance model has had its share of problems. Community colleges have been noted for their growth and the rapid turnover of student populations. One of the strengths of participative governance is the emphasis it places upon such learned behaviors as rational decision making in the group setting. This potential strength has also been one of the great weaknesses. Students and faculty have not behaved as theorized in the absence of external controls, treating the freedom to develop as a license to pursue personal gratification, frequently at the expense of group welfare. Administrators with limited understanding of the capabilities of a governance structure have delegated coordinating functions, bogging down committees and senates in masses of trivia. Like trustees, governance committees do not always understand the difference between policy formulation and administration, sometimes resulting in poor execution of decisions and reduced administrative morale.

It is only fair to add that many of the problems of the shared authority model can be traced to its improper use in response to threats of student activism or faculty organization. The collegium requires above all a sense of community and a commitment to decision making through rational processes. It fails completely as a response to confrontation or conflict because it incorporates no procedures for the effective exercise of sanctions.

---

[3]Richardson, et al., *Governance for the Two Year College*, Prentice Hall, Inc., 1972.

The most attractive aspect of the shared authority model is that it represents everyone's first choice as what a college ought to be. The concept of community as representative of relationships among students, faculty and administrators is much more appealing than the authority relationships of the bureaucratic model. Participative governance can be very effective in managing change of a lasting nature because it offers a way of modifying fundamental attitudes and values through group processes, a characteristic missing in the other two models. Consulting with groups clearly improves administrative decision making because of the opportunity provided to test faculty and student reaction before a policy is announced. Involvement in the decision making process strengthens the level of commitment to goal attainment for participants. The collegium process of interaction and influence offers an institution a continuing opportunity to renew itself, testing current values and attitudes in the light of new circumstances, and modifying its policies and structures accordingly.

The third and most recent model of college organization has been advanced by J. Victor Baldridge based on his study of New York University.[4] The political model views the institution as a shifting coalition of power blocs and vested interests. Authority in the political model derives not so much from the board of trustees as from the power of interest groups operating within a social context.

Administrative offices and joint committees or senates are less important in the political model either as a source of authority or as a procedure for making decisions. The interests and priorities of students, faculty, administrators and trustees are different. These differences lead to conflict. Pressures to resolve the conflict come from the social context in the form of legislative action, organized expressions of concern and public opinion in general. Decisions about the conflict are made throughout the institution by a variety of groups who are interested in the issue. Ultimately decisions are legitimated through a legislative process culminating in a contractual form of agreement spelling out the constraints within which all parties must function in executing a decision. Compromises reached during the process of conflict resolution serve as the basis for new conflict and so the cycle continues.

In the political model, collective bargaining replaces administrative structure and joint committees as the focus of the decision making process. The experience of institutions that have had an opportunity to live with collective bargaining for a significant period of time raises questions about the effectiveness of an adversarial approach in dealing with issues not necessarily involving conflict. Faculty members sometimes opt for collective bargaining to strengthen their role in the decision making process. A procedure which involves three to five faculty members with a comparable number of administrators and making all of the significant decisions that will affect professional staff for one to three years under conditions of secrecy may result in less involvement rather than more. In addition, bargaining tables have only two sides. While efforts have been made to include students on one side or the other or as neutral observers, no generally accepted method of student involvement currently exists. The assumption that student interests will be a primary concern of either faculty or administrators is no more convincing for the political model than it was for the bureaucratic model. The characters are essentially unchanged, only the titles have been changed to protect the guilty. The political model also makes

---

[4]Victor J. Baldridge, *Power and Conflict in the University*, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1971.

some highly questionable assumptions about the willingness of faculty and students to tolerate high levels of involvement in legislative processes over extended periods of time.

Despite the limitations of the political model, it is apparent that it offers the best explanation of the significant variables in college governance during the past five years. Neither the bureaucratic model nor the shared authority model provide insight or procedures for dealing with conflict. The political model offers a legislative process, responsive to social concerns and culminating in a contract which can be legally enforced by the courts. Authority is not nebulous paternalism from a board of trustees: it takes the form of sanctions as concrete as an injunction or a writ of mandamus. Negotiated contracts are precise concerning prerogatives and obligations. Change in policies can occur more easily because existing understandings are codified and then subjected to periodic review.

Earlier in this paper I suggested the assumptions we make about our institutions and each other strongly influence what we tend to become. This point has important implications for governance of community colleges in the future. Two of the models, the bureaucratic and the shared authority, can be termed consensus models. For the bureaucratic model to function effectively there has to be general agreement about the nature and the level of authority to be exercised by the board of trustees. If consensus does exist about board powers then its decisions will be implemented effectively. Under the shared authority model, there is still consensus about board powers but the locus of decision making moves from the board and its agents to representative groups who exercise delegated powers in rational ways. The political model by contrast is a conflict model. There is no consensus about board powers and differences of opinion are compromised through negotiation then incorporated in a written contract which becomes the source of authority for the time it is in force.

As constituents of community colleges we are faced with the necessity of choosing among quite different views of our institutions. In addition, our choice is not a free one but may be forced upon us by actions of groups over which we exercise little or no influence. We tend to see the models as alternatives for institutions rather than issues. Either we are not organized in which case we try to solve all issues through consensus procedures or we are organized and must therefore view every decision from an adversarial point of view.

Let me give an example of how this view creates problems. Recently I visited a multi-campus institution in which considerable sentiment in favor of collective bargaining existed among the faculty. The state legislature was considering a bill to authorize collective bargaining and a number of faculty leaders from the institution were actively lobbying for its passage. Administrators felt threatened and their changing assumption about relationships with the faculty was reflected in their actions. In a very controversial decision an assistant campus director refused two members of the faculty approval to attend a professional meeting of the state education association which was also a major advocate of collective bargaining. The reason for the action given involved concern about the faculty members missing classes. However, approval for attending this meeting had always been given routinely in the past. Further several other faculty members were given permission to attend professional meetings on the same day under essentially identical circumstances. The only difference was the posture on collective bargaining by the sponsoring organizations.

I have also observed the all or nothing attitude of trustees who are shocked by a faculty decision to adopt collective bargaining. Under such circumstances it is not uncommon for trustees to take positions in opposition to the faculty even when common sense would dictate that no actual difference of opinion need exist. Supporting this response is the community college version of the Salem witch hunters in the form of trustees who have gained notoriety through mismanagement of their own institutions, thereby becoming experts in reacting to particularly excessive student or faculty actions. They ride around the countryside exhorting other trustees to take idiotic positions to show the faculty and students who is boss. Only slightly less destructive are the professional negotiators who have mastered the process of collective bargaining at the expense of losing sight of the objectives of the institutions they represent. From the lofty heights of the two or three contracts they have negotiated, they recommend turning institutional relationships into a giant chess game where every movement involves strategy aimed at controlling the spaces by manipulating the pieces.

There are alternatives to witch hunts and chess games for administrators, trustees and faculty. There is no single model that can help us understand and cope with all of the complex issues that swirl around our colleges in the seventies. A combination of the three models judiciously applied to take advantage of their strengths and to minimize their weaknesses offers our brightest hope. Effective planning and coordination require a competent bureaucratic organization. If we are to retain any of the humanistic values traditionally associated with the process of higher education we must take advantage of every opportunity to use the rational group processes of the collegium. If we are to solve the harsh issues of allocation of resources, staff welfare, and security, we have no choice but to submit our differences to the give and take of the bargaining process.

There is evidence to suggest that institutions are in fact learning to mix models to achieve their objectives. Some faculties have held back from requesting bargaining unit certification because ways have been found to use governance structures effectively to deal with issues related to the curriculum and the program of services. Issues involving economics and welfare are submitted to an informal bargaining process which follows very closely the procedures established for formal collective bargaining. Guarantees are provided to ensure that unilateral action will not take place in changing personnel policies of importance to the faculty.

In another college that has been involved extensively in collective bargaining for five years, faculty and administrators are now meeting quietly to explore the development of a governance structure to which some of the decisions now being made by the bargaining teams can be delegated. This is a much more difficult way of mixing models. The small number of faculty and administrators who presently serve on the bargaining teams for this college have become accustomed to making all of the really important decisions. As a result their status has been enhanced. Both administrative and faculty negotiators are resisting the development of a governance structure because they are aware that this will reduce their importance.

Consensus leads to cooperation. Conflict breeds resistance. For this reason it is important to keep as many decisions as possible off the collective bargaining table. This can be done only by administrators who understand and practice the skills of participative administration. Such administrators know how to establish goals and to measure their attainment without destroying the motivation of their subordinates. Participative administrators are team players not empire builders. Participative administrators encourage clear communication and use involvement in decision

making processes as a way of securing consensus and group commitment. Coaching, supportive relationships and management by objectives replace supervisor established and evaluated objectives and close supervision. Participative administration is a fresh wind blowing through institutions long closed to new ideas because of a stultifying authoritarianism.

Collective bargaining and participative governance are competing methods of solving problems. Each model is likely to be considered each time a new issue arises or an old one is considered anew. No single constituency of the college will be able to make the decision on which approach will be selected. In general, however, the effect of participative administration is to increase confidence in the administrative structure and therefore to broaden the range of decisions that will be made through consensus techniques as opposed to conflict. Participative behavior is learned behavior. Institutions seeking to interrupt the cycle of conflict and to accomplish more decision making through consensus techniques will need to commit themselves to a careful plan of staff development.

The topic of staff development is a separate issue. Suffice it to say that there is a sequence which can be defined and which must be followed beginning with training sessions and staff applications for administrators. A failure to understand the developmental sequence can lead institutions to plunge into advanced applications such as management by objectives or complex governance systems without laying the necessary groundwork. The unsatisfactory results then lead to wholly unjustified conclusions about the effectiveness of the techniques.

The 1973 Assembly of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges focused on staff development. While I have not yet seen the published report I would be willing to bet that most of the attention was given to faculty development. It is always easier to see the mote in the other fellow's eye. The proper use of faculty resources and the maintenance of an environment which contributes to human development require administrators who understand and can use the insights developed in behavioral science and already applied in many instances in the industrial setting. We can have a better human environment and improved goal attainment but in order to do it administration will have to become more a science and less a melange of personal idiosyncrasies.

THE FACULTY STAKE IN GOVERNANCE

by Richard J. Frankie
Associate Professor of Higher Education
The George Washington University
Washington, D.C.

At the heart of many controversies regarding community-junior colleges and universities is the issue of governance. Hydra-headed, governance issues have provoked major questions: faculty power, their stake in governance, the changing power of students, institutional goals and social involvement, and the ever-present problems created by communication gaps. There has been a proliferation of studies, reports and textbooks on governance in recent years which have investigated and reviewed past knowledge and recent experience.[1] Particularly recent and relevant for the topic of this Symposium is Dr. Richardson's book entitled Governance for the Two-Year College.[2] In addition, very recent developments such as decreasing student enrollments, stringent financial contractions, resultant non-renewal and dismissal of faculty, both tenured and non-tenured, new federal definitions of "post-secondary education," and U.S. Supreme Court legal decisions (i.e., Sindermann and Roth Cases) have caused college faculties at all levels to reconsider their roles in institutional governance. Pivotal to understanding the issues involved is the study of power and authority relationships. In recent years at no other formal level of education have faculty members been more militant to pressure to participate more directly in the two-year college. By traditional organization, the operation of colleges and universities has been based upon the establishment of a hierarchy of authority, which has served to define points where specific decisions will be made--that is, where the best information exists and where participation is at the optimum. Basic to this approach has been the attempt to afford in the organization the opportunity to work and to make decisions as an academic team.

However, the concept of "teamwork," as viewed by social and behavioral scientists, or of peer or collegial relationships and participation differ markedly from the traditional hierarchial, bureaucratic approach. The difference may be sensed in a distinction made by Barnard between people as "objects to be manipulated" and as "subjects to be satisfied."[3]

As the community college has emerged as a full partner in the field of higher education, many of its faculty members have come to feel strongly that they are peers among themselves and, indeed, of the administrative officers. These perceptions of functional roles have become a major factor of conflict; the conflict has, in turn, fostered the concept of "shared authority." As Richardson et al. have written, directing the efforts of the faculty from the top of the hierarchy of authority has become questionable at best.

Faculty disenchantment with the traditional form of governance directs itself particularly at the organizational form of faculty participation, which in the two-year colleges, like most higher education institutions, is the traditional faculty council (or academic senate), a representative, legislative body. A definite part of the college's structure, it derives its representative status from the authority of the whole faculty. Needless to say, some faculty councils are willed much authority and others, very little. (It is to be noted that formal organization carries no guarantee of effectiveness.)

Uneasiness with this traditional internal form of faculty participation has led to many college faculties throughout higher education to seek unity and strength by promoting a second form, an "external" organization--such as, for example, the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), the National Education Association (NEA), and the American Federation of Teachers (AFT). The most significant of the "external" organizations have been the local professorial unions of the AFT, which have been formed at public and private universities, but are strongest and most widespread in the community colleges. In general, these external organizations have in the past served as lobbyists or pressure groups and have not been active participants in the formal decision-making process.

However, now the bargaining agency, whatever form it takes, involves direct, legal "shared authority," and it differs markedly from the previous forms because the process it involves is one of direct confrontation or an adversary relationship. Implicit in this process of accommodation or "antagonistic cooperation" are outright tests of power among the negotiators. In recent years, both unions and professional associations have acted as formal bargaining agents. This approach has made significant gains in the recent years, especially in the two-year colleges ....[4] While faculty members in approximately 150 two-year colleges across the nation are rejecting the traditional, bureaucratic, hierarchical style in favor of a concept of distribution and sharing of authority to foster the creative potentialities of the faculty and administration, the aspiration to power, the contemplation of it, and the movement toward it, may, each or all, differ significantly from the actual exercise of it. In a relationship of power one is always tempted to consider and quote Lord Acton's famous bromide that, "Power corrupts. Absolute power corrupts absolutely." Everyone seems to know about this. Far fewer, I believe, are aware of a related, but significantly different commentary by George Bernard Shaw. "Power," he said, "does not corrupt men. But fools in positions of power corrupt power." Let us leave to either theologians or to individual conscience the questions related to the corruption of men.

Power may, of course, assume variant forms, and its exercise exhibits differing functions; but, on the academic scene, the emergent manifestation has been pre-empted from the industrial experience. Thus, organized drives for recruitment by the NEA and the AFT and even the Teamsters are well under way, and continual efforts to adapt organizational policy to the emergence of collective bargaining are evident in the deliberations of the AAUP.

What are some observations of collective bargaining at the community college level? The essence of the process must first be understood. Well over a decade ago a scholarly analyst attempted to provide some insight.

> The theory underlying collective bargaining is that if the parties bargain in good faith they will practically always reach an agreement...Collective bargaining does not force the parties to agree. It is merely the procedure most likely to produce satisfactory agreements when employed in good faith by both parties.[5]

However palatable this viewpoint may prove to be, it must nonetheless, be amplified to be appreciated. There is clearly inherent in its innovation by faculty a determined effort to diminish or at least substantially alter previously existing

administrative or Board of Control prerogatives, whether stated or assumed.

> Collective bargaining...is essentially a power relationship and a process of power accommodation. The essence of bargaining is compromise and concession-making on matters over which there is conflict between the parties involved in bargaining. The avowed theoretical purpose and practical effect of collective bargaining is to grant employee organizations an increasing control over the decision-making process of management.[6]

To the extent that this evaluation is accurate, a number of questions are generated. For example: To what degree is the administrative posture determined by a reaction to the disturbance of the total status quo? Conversely, how long and how well can a faculty penetration of the decision-making function be sustained? The administrative commitment to this arena is continual and essentially full time, while such commitment by the faculty will not only be part time but also peripheral to their basic function, teaching. A substantial commitment to decision-making by the faculty would tend to immerse them in "administrative" activities at the expense of teaching.

To a certain measure, faculty pursuit of power may emerge as a reaction against bureaucratic tendencies within administration and as a form of protest against depersonalization of faculty-administrative relationships.[7] To the extent that this is true, it would seem possible that inherent frustrations will be generated if the thrust of the faculty power apparatus is toward formalization of faculty-administrative relationships and is sustained and/or intensified. The tendency would seem to be to develop, within whatever framework embraced by the faculty to channel power, a bureaucracy of leadership all its own--thus, creating an eventual estrangement between leadership and membership as an "administration" appears within faculty ranks.

Further, as the exercise of faculty power continues there is bound to be some internal disagreement on emphases, issues, directions, tactics, means, or ends, with a possible congealing of assent and dissent groupings. Thus, the potential for majority-minority schism would impend. Where this occurs, politics is likely to intrude with contested elections for leadership posts and create a probable overturn of leaders and/or reversal of positions. As a result, the character and direction of leadership could change significantly.

Faced with both external as well as internal rivalry, leadership would find the bargaining process not only the determinant of a contract but also of one's "political career" in faculty leadership. If such be the case, a certain wariness of compromise may occur and a degree of rigidity result which would be detrimental to the accommodation process so vital to the resolution of power comfrontations.

In candor, however, a greater danger lurks for the effective conduct of the bargaining process. It will be difficult to sustain for extended periods of time the dedication of time and effort which this process demands, and the faculty may well be wary of those willing to make such a continuing commitment to an activity peripheral to their basic function of teaching. If rotation or displacement of leadership should occur, a period of educative experience will be required for

those not readily attuned to the power accommodation process. This period may well be a luxury that can be ill afforded in our fast-moving situation.

It does seem extremely probable that another aspect of educative experience will be necessary. Idealism seems to be high among the faculty. The adjustment process would entail the delineation of the distinction between the desirable and the possible. What should be characteristic of a protest movement of quality, and the achievement of what can be, the more suitable business of a power struggle, must be distinguished. It is one thing for the faculty to cry out against injustice and quite another to rectify it.

Such idealism may cause the faculty to rebel against the concept of compromise--a keystone of successful bargaining. But where compromise is regarded as synonymous with either surrender or the sacrifice of principle, it will certainly not flourish. It must be regarded as a strength rather than a weakness and as a function of, rather than a desertion of, integrity.[8]

Beyond this, the bargaining table eschews the abstract, the theoretical, the "academic" consideration. It is a place where men face practical problems and attempt practical solutions in a practical manner. "What will you settle for?" and "Upon what basis can we make a deal?" are questions alien, even repugnant, to the idealist. But, to the bargainer they represent the omnipresent bases for resolution of conflict. Embracing all of this review of negotiations is the need for understanding what transpires at the bargaining table. When veteran faculty gain experience in negotiation they learn it is unquestionably an act of contest. However, the benefit of the process would seem greater if it could be recognized that it is a conflict of roles--not of persons! "Collective bargaining is merely one manifestation of human relations. It can succeed only where there is desire to show mutual respect and recognition of the rights and responsibilities of both parties." [9] As yet, only the most basic effort is discernible in the preparation and development of faculty organizations on the one hand, and associations of administrators and boards on the other.

Without deterring responsible men and women in education from the use of power, one could suggest the wisdom of the prophet Mohammed: "He is the best of men who dislikes power." Power is a means of value, even perhaps virtue, but only tragically is it an end in itself.

Some will inevitably question the propriety and the applicability of collective bargaining to the community college as a segment of higher education. For approximately thirty-three (33) states this is a moot point. The law in these states grants "rights of unionization."

There is a problem, however, that touches upon this somewhat. Should the traditional prerogatives of faculty and the current legal prerogatives of a bargaining agent not coincide or, even, in some cases, collide, how are they to be reconciled? This is a matter worthy of some concern. For example, one item in question seems to be the role of the faculty, as such, vis-a-vis the administration in an institution where bargaining prescribes wages, hours, and working conditions on a labor-management basis. Warning of a potential dilemma was made in a dissenting statement by Bierstedt and Machlup in the majority report of the Special Committee on Representation of Economic Interests of the American Association of University Professors:

> The AAUP, in short, has always maintained that the operation of a university is one of shared responsibility. Once an exception is made, no matter how extraordinary the circumstances, the situation is radically transformed into one of antagonistic and even hostile opposition. Once this happens--even once--we become employees of an administration and of a governing board. Once this happens the administration is no longer working for us, but we are working for it.[10]

No labor organization maintains that it should determine or even be involved in the composition of management any more than it would be willing to concede any management role in delineation of its own affairs. Any faculty worth its salt would assert its right to be an effective voice in the determinations of administration. This dilemma has yet to be resolved.

Evolving from this, however, is the question of whether valid expectations of productive outcomes can be generated as the bargaining table is approached. The successful avoidance of impasse and the prevention of crises would seem dependent on this, even though neither is assured.

If we review all of the college professors, librarians and student counselors organized into some form of collective bargaining arrangement, we find 82,300 faculty members on 308 campuses out of a total of 540,000 full-time faculty at 2,900 colleges and universities. After an initial surge in the late 60's and early 70's a definite slowdown nationally is observable. For example, in 1966 total institutions with bargaining agents numbered 11 with 3,000 members. By 1971, membership reached 67,300; in 1972, 79,500. But in 1973, the year the job and salary crunch began to be strongly felt, the increase was less than 3,000.[11]

Union officials give two reasons for the slowdown. The first is that the late 60's brought together most of the campuses whose faculties were eager and ready for unionization. The second reason, according to Robert Simpson of the NEA, may be that "employment insecurity among some faculties is causing them to teeter, and they're not convinced that a union can actually protect them."[12] A third reason is that many college teachers may be changing their minds about abandoning their traditional feelings of collegiality and professionalism. Last but not least, the literature shows that educational leaders have become more effective in introducing new and creative models of participation in the governance and administration of colleges, particularly at the level of the community-junior college.

Conclusion

Power confrontations may be productive and even necessary; they should, however, be recognized for what they are, and what they are not. They are not exercises in logic or reason--emotionalism is far more prevalent. Neither are they means for determining who is right. They are, rather, the means for determining who is stronger. Under these conditions, it is my considered opinion that the average faculty member across the country is not "power" oriented and will choose another vehicle for the resolution of conflict. Their values, preferences, attitudes and their way of life dictate maximizing other social interaction processes.

There is yet one more consideration. Collective bargaining, thus far, has failed to evidence a creative impulse and to demonstrate the contributory effect claimed by some of its most ardent advocates. It is concerned primarily and almost exclusively, with distributive functions--the "sharing" of the available power and resources.

Neither by initiation nor acceptance has the bargaining agent thus far offered anything to satisfy the student segment of non-faculty staff needs of the community college and, indeed, the public reaction, often adverse, to the work stoppages may discourage both legislator and voter from the urgently needed acceleration of such support. It is this that may prove to be the real test of the viability of faculty power in governance.

REFERENCES

[1]Carol Shulman, Governance (Compendium Series of Current Research Programs and Proposals), ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, The George Washington University, Washington, D.C., May, 1970.

[2]Richard C. Richardson, Clyde E. Blocker, and Louis W. Bender, Governance for the Two-Year College (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall Inc., 1972).

[3]Chester I. Barnard, The Functions of the Executive (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1938), p. 40.

[4]Ray A. Howe, The Community College Board of Trustees and Negotiations with Faculty (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1973), p. 5.

[5]Myron Lieberman, Education as a Profession (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall Inc., 1966), p. 355.

[6]Wesley A. Wildman and Charles Perry, "Group Conflict and School Organization," Phi Delta Kappan (January, 1966), p. 245.

[7]James Cass and Max Bernbaum, "What Makes Teachers Militant," Saturday Review (January 20, 1968), p. 56.

[8]Richard J. Frankie and Ray A. Howe, "Faculty Power in the Community College," Theory Into Practice, VII, NO. 2 (April, 1968), p. 86.

[9]Harold W. Storey, "Collective Bargaining Under Wisconsin Law," Teachers College Journal (December, 1965), p. 115.

[10]Bernard Bierstedt and Fritz Machlup, "Representation of Economic Interests," AAUP Bulletin (Summer, 1966), p. 233.

[11]Iver Peterson, "All Professors Learning Relevant Economics," New York Times (January 6, 1974).

[12]Ibid.

THE STUDENT STAKE IN GOVERNANCE

by Alan R. Shark
Chairman, City of New York
Student Senate

The subject we talked about today is models. We've talked about two, we've talked about governance and we've talked about collective bargaining. I think the key here is that they are interrelated. When I was young, I put together models made by Aurora. You would make them yourself by using airplane glue. Whether it was a ship or plane, those were the models that I was most accustomed to. I would have a diagram and I would put it together by the numbers and I would really enjoy it. I would either take it out to the park with me or play in the bathtub with it depending upon whether it was meant to float or not.

When you get older you realized that models are something sexual and that they appear in magazines or on television. One took a new interest in models.

Then one goes to school and learns that there's another kind of model which is much more difficult. That is the invisible model. I couldn't understand it when people started talking about black-box theory, inputs and outputs. Suddenly there is another model and it is invisible and it is very easy to write about and critize it and boy, it's something we're still confused about. That's one of the reasons why we are here today, to discuss invisible models. But invisible models have a way of landing themselves on paper. I've had a lot of experience in governance and certain things look great on paper. A perfect example was Hunter College's in the University of New York's governance plan. It was a bound document and many colleges copied it immediately as soon as they saw it because it was an academic senate, and it included over 200 people--it had maintenance workers in it, it had clerical staff, it included everybody...alumni and everybody that normally would not be included in any governance plans that I have seen, reviewed and worked with. We said, "Wow," this is really great and the City University is very proud of it." The student body president there invited me to take a look at it, and he didn't look all that excited, but it was a beautiful plan. I looked it over and I said, "this really could work. It does include all the segments of the community of interest on the campus." We were all very excited about it. We had people coming from all over the country and writing to us about it and asking us if we have a copy of the plan, and I realized there were many plans that were copied from this model...again, model.

I walked in the door. It was quiet outside and I said, "Oh my god, that's it." There were 200 screaming people who could not really understand it. They were just sitting there, a reflection of an invisible model written on paper, and suddenly finding themselves totally aghast at what they had created. It certainly was a monster and it did not work. It does not work to this day. So we do see a lot of things on paper and it's kind of hard when we see them transformed into reality. And this was a perfect example.

Students are talking about models in regard to academic governance. I was almost surprised, "Gee, you're still talking about governance, it's kind of a dead issue in many areas." But it has been revived because of collective bargaining. The students have the great frustration of not having the armies of people behind them, or the press following them wherever they go, and anything they say published. We're living in new times, in times which I perhaps prefer and feel more comfortable with. No governmental body can sustain the kind of activism that we found in the late 60s and early 70s. Whether it be government or schools or whatever, you just can't

sustain that kind of activism. But it certainly did open the doors. It opened the doors for students who finally realized they are an important part of the academic community of interest. We've had all sorts of things coming out of it that I think are rather important...a position paper on student powers and rights by the American Federation of Teachers...the National Education Association also came out with a plan entirely regarding students as far as their rights to organize and their rights to have a student government. That was very significant. Almost every campus adopted something like this "Student Rights, Code of Conduct and Disciplinary Procedures." This one happens to be from Temple University. Also "Students are Citizens," which is a pamphlet I helped to prepare back in the days when I was in community college.

Just for your information, since everybody else has such marvelous credentials in the area of community colleges, I can only say that I have gone to two of them... day, night and summer...and graduated with honors and also that I was a student body president at Staton Island Community College before going on. So I am keenly aware of the problems and the problems of governance are actually different from those of a four-year college. I think you have a unique opportunity in this state in that your age group here is much older than in, say, City University. So many of the arguments we hear on the East Coast are really unfounded here as far as maturity and, of course, the magic word "continuity." But I'll get into that very shortly.

There are many things that have been spoken about on governance and the first thing that I think was adequately covered was, "How did we get to this point in time?" People identify student activism with the VietNam War, with the shooting and violence of Kent State. But yet when we trace back, certain evidence is found that campus unrest really began quite a bit before that. These were the national benchmarks that put people together and brought people together. But certainly the disenchantment of the young was reflected clearly before that; I would say about five years before that. I think it really came about, if I can speak in such general terms, with the disenchantment over college, or suddenly looking into what was happening to them during their time in college. I think in the 50s, when we had this time of passivity, it was a time when people went by certain rules and a different set of standards, and that was simply this: "You put up with my curriculum, my cafeteria, my academic lifestyle, my classroom, my 40 minutes, my term papers, my assignements and you will have a piece of the promised land." In many cases they did. People at that point got good jobs not by where they went or what they took, but because they had a college degree. As that increased, people began to question, "What's happening to that content, what's happening within that four-year period of time?" As more people became aware of that time slot and what was happening while they were there; because of inflation, because of the rise in unemployment, people began to look around. I think that is one of the major areas where students started to realize their connection with the outside society, aside from the fact that through the media, they became a more mature body as far as being aware of things. But once this group suddenly became aware, the era of governance was created.

We talked earlier this morning about how the name governance was actually created. It is a kind of unusual term, but it certainly implies shared decision-making. But students were never considered a part of the academic community of interest until the riots, until the disruptions. Suddenly the American Civil Liberties Union and many other organizations said, "yes, students are indeed citi-

zens and they should enjoy rights as other citizens, should enjoy priveleges as other citizens, and should have a say in the decision-making process." Well, enter governance. That became a big issue and it still is.

The areas that are being covered are varied from campus to campus. But it seems to be that we are competing with two basic forces, not we here, per se, but on the national level. There are those who want to maintain the "academic integrity through academic senates," and those who want to take care of economic issues through the process of collective bargaining.

Then we have a third school of thought, which is, combine the two. That becomes quite confusing. In the state of Massachusetts, they cannot so far bargain for salaries or fringe benefits; but, yet they are bargaining collectively, and they put their entire governance plan into the contract. The question then remains, "What happens when the public employees finally lobby effectively enough to get their salaries put into that contract?" Then they will have total open scope of negotiations. This has created an enormous concern by many people throughout the country who are watching this, because anything goes, anything can be put into that contract. So far you have limitations with your scope of bargaining here, in governance as you would in a contract. But there, once that is done, you have everything unless someone puts their foot down, and that's hard to do politically.

The areas we're talking about in reference to governance usually start with the charter. Many groups might take a semester or a year just to get a charter alone. The charter might just create a body to come out with the next step, and so we're really forming bodies, to form bodies, to form bodies, to form bodies. At City University only half of our colleges have complied with the overall ruling which states that each college must come up with a governance plan approved by the board, approved by local students, approved by faculty, and approved by local administration for greater shared authority.

You have two kinds of governance plans, though. One is through the vehicle of a charter, a structure to accommodate greater sharing of authority and responsibility. That group can do all the decision-making. It's usually a small body. Or you can take a larger body, which is the second point, and that is the body to create a body and to carry out specific tasks; these could be task forces, committees, or commissions, with specific duties and recommendations which may or may not need or require reporting back to the original body. Their recommendations might be valid and can be taken right to the college president.

The thing about collective bargaining that concerns me particularly is that many areas of governance are being put into the collective bargaining contracts. There is an irony there because now students are being denied something they were given the right to. That is, as more and more matters are put into the collective bargaining contract, especially in areas of campus governance, I think the argument for students to be included in this new process is substantially raised even though until now we are really going by laws that state there will be only two parties.

There are many students actively in this country trying to find some kind of way to include themselves as a third party. That to me is kind of confusing and yet almost necessary out of self-defense. I don't think we have to do that; but yet if the students are to be included in the process, some way must be found to

have their interests represented.

Obviously, faculty have found collective bargaining far more attractive for various reasons. One is that they are no longer dependent upon a college president's decision. Regardless of personalities, they like the flexibility that they can go beyond that person, go beyond in many cases, the board, and go to arbitration or have fact-finding or have mediation. A governance plan does not have that, so it is not as attractive in that way. Also, it's a binding contract, it's a legal contract, and it's very rigid in many ways, which I think is a disadvantage. Yet some people argue it's an advantage, depending upon their frame of reference. You have major advantages as far as enforceability of the contract and a means of recourse. It's a special grievance procedure which is probably one of the key issues aside from the economic factors. We are in a dilemma right now with students and people talking about it.

No, we do not have millions of people behind us. But we're living in a new era also. A more responsible student leader has emerged, I would think, to the point where he is now implementing the things that other people talked about.

There are really three ways that I see in which people are functioning in this area. One is informally; they're informally working with the faculty group, who are informally working with the administrative group or the trustees in trying to bring about a student perspective. Informality worked in Massachusetts because informality brought the student body president to the bargaining table there as an independent observer and negotiator. Although that person did not have any veto power over what the two parties might decide, and while that person was really sitting there at the mercy of the agreement of the two parties involved--she did get a lot of gainful input as far as students are concerned in her particular campus. Now other campuses in that state system are following the same thing.

We do have students informally being part of the administrative side. This happened in Michigan. We have students that are informally sitting in on the faculty side. That's the informal thing.

You also have the legislative process. The legislative process is basically a process by which students are rallying in their state legislatures. Of course, this really excludes private colleges who must depend upon the rulings of the National Labor Relations Board, but certainly on the state level, many students are working. In the states of New York, California, Oregon, this state, and I think there are two other examples, where students are rallying to either draft or pass upon legislation already introduced that would include them at least as an observer to the process. In New York I have authored a bill that is still pending. It will probably take a while before people realize its full implications. It would not include students in the bargaining process. What we do in this bill is define what the student rights are in the areas of governance and say that governance will not be put into the collective bargaining contract. The reason why we took that attitude is because we felt that, given the politics of our state, New York would not grant students third party status or observer status.

But we defined our rights, said, "These are our rights, people believe these are our rights, don't put them in a process where we have no say." If that is passed, and it has a good chance of being passed, that can be used later on. The main thing is the state legislature would be recognizing our rights.

In California it's different. In California, students are rallying for direct representation as a third party. Their student leaders feel hopeful it will get passed. I'm not so sure. But these are the kinds of things that are going on. They do not require an army of people behind you. It does require the respect of the parties you are working with. It requires a lot of faith and trust, that that person is acting on behalf of his students, that there is that kind of leadership and follow-through which is sometimes challenged on many campuses.

The third way is the legal way, and that's more or less protecting one of the major concerns that students have--the interruption of their education, and that's one thing I guess I neglected. There are three basic areas in which students have fears. The second one--which I'll mention now--is faculty strikes which interrupt their education. The threat of strikes for job action creates a climate of apprehension.

The legal process has been demonstrated here at Tacoma Community College as well as in two colleges in Pennsylvania where students actually obtained a court injunction or were about to obtain a court injunction that ultimately resulted in signing of the agreement or the ending of the strike. So this legal way of finding procedural faults or fallacies in making sure the laws are being adhered to is a way to protect that one area--faculty strikes.

Students also have a fear of collective bargaining in the sense that increases in salary and fringe benefits won by faculty unions will come out of the students' pockets in the form of higher tuition and/or fees. In fact, there may be a reduction in student services as well as course offerings, due to contractual obligations. This has been documented. And the third area is what we're really talking about at the moment and that is that faculty/collective bargaining will diminish the expanded student role in campus decision-making won during the turmoil of the late 1960s.

You might ask, "What are the areas that students are concerned about?" Certainly we don't want to argue as was said before, over when the windows of our campuses should be washed, or if they should be washed to save money, or whatever. There are many areas that students are extremely tied into as far as interest and commitment. I would like to just go over a few of them.

First of all, we are talking about the inclusion of concerned parties which might sound rather basic but yet very important. It's the recognition that there are four parties. I think that some states have not matured enough, as this state has, to recognize that there are four parties...a lot of people like to leave out trustees for some reason and yet they are a very important part. So you do have the students, faculty, administration, and trustees. You might even have a fifth which is your alumni. But, you are recognizing that there are different interests when it comes to academic decisions.

The second area that seems to concern people is the area of decentralization. Though many colleges or universities or state boards are striving for decentralization there are two major factors that counteract that. In the first place, collective bargaining--which really mandates, in many cases except in your community colleges, that one bargain collectively for everybody. It was mentioned that City University has the largest unionized faculty among community colleges. True, they have the largest faculty period. They represent 16,000 faculty and the community colleges are lumped together

with the four-year colleges and the salary ranges are the same, although the teaching load is a little more in the community college than in the four-year college.

The other area that deters decentralization is funding models. The state legislature wants to deal with one group--not 30 or 40 or whatever the number is. So that becomes a problem which is not a problem because it just can't be attained in many cases, although I recommend that a balance be maintained if possible.

The third area is the academic grievance procedure. When we talk about grievances we normally talk about faculty grievances, although I know of an instance at my old community college where the college president filed the first grievance against the faculty. Of course, you don't do that--it's only a one-way process, but I think students must have grievance procedures. It's very, very important that it goes beyond perhaps, the college president, beyond the state board, to where one actually gets resolutions to the conflicts, where there are steps and procedures. I think that many conflicts in the past could have been avoided, the melting pot could have been mellowed in certain areas had there been grievance procedures. But students weren't even recognized as part of it so if there was anything procedural, just go by the informal means...if it can be handled, great--if it can't--forget it.

Community relations is a very important area. I don't know how much it is here, but at least on the East Coast it's a very important issue--on how the college relates to the local community. A lot of areas are put into the governance plans that will recognize those needs and interests.

A fifth area is campus freedom and safeguards--a rather ambiguous topic, but that would include the basic mission of the college. Sometimes, we have to really redefine where we're going and what we're doing and what we have to offer. It might be a two-year plan, a six-month plan, a two-week plan, or a ten-year plan.

Number six is the availability of student records. This became an issue as to whom our records are available to. Can the FBI walk in tomorrow and pull things out? To what extent does the student have confidentiality as far as records? Certainly faculty has confidentiality or safeguards as to their rights and privileges as citizens. I think that should be extended to students as well.

Seven is curriculum. We're finding out in certain contracts, that curricula and procedures are being put forth in the contracts that in some cases, bar students by not including them.

This is always a hard one--parking facilities. It seems to be a very big issue on campus. I was at one campus in upstate New York and they were bragging that we might have open admissions but they have open parking. They had just defeated separate faculty parking, and that was a major victory they had worked on for two years.

Number Nine is academic calendar, which is that important. I know, I just came back from Rhode Island recently and that was one of the major priorities. They felt that they would rather have their school year begin later or end early or something like that. That's very important to them as to when they're going to have holidays and when they're not.

Number Ten--student services...that can be broken down into many areas. Student services are extremely important as to how they're carried out and who is being served and who is not being served. That can be broken down into Number Eleven--the counseling center. There are many complaints about counseling; what is being counseled and what is not, how many people are actually being provided for, and what kind of information is being obtained and given out.

Financial aid, Number Twelve, is a very important area, as far as policy is concerned, which is sometimes excluded in governance plans or included.

Of course, overall teaching effectiveness which would include teacher evaluations is important. A study will be available from Baruch College's National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining very shortly that analyzes all the contracts that have been signed in the country as to student evaluation procedures. In many cases, students are mentioned but have not been consulted in the process. So it's very flattering to see that student evaluations will be heeded, but that's all they know about it. There was a demand by the Professional Staff Congress in New York that would, if they had had their way, have limited student involvement in professional evaluations to filling out a questionnaire. They would decide when, how and then would decide what the form would be, and they would keep the information; the students would never see it. That's a major concern. I know many student groups are very concerned about seeing it and in some cases publishing it to let other students know what to expect. It does not necessarily have to be in a derogatory or negative context. I have an evaluation from City College, and I would say that 95% of them rated very highly, and there were interesting comments as to what to expect as far as course work--"He gives a final, he doesn't give a final, he gives long term papers, he doesn't, he's very interesting in class, he's boring in class but you can learn a lot"--very interesting things that would help a student when he comes to register for class.

Number Fourteen--food services. Everywhere I go, I get the same grin, that look of ptomaine poisoning. It's incredible, the problem of food services on campus, but it is a problem. People starve to death rather than eat.

Bookstore operations have become a problem. Everyone's saying, "Why do we pay $15.00 for this one book when it's only 45 pages?"

Grading systems are very important to many people.

We're not talking about total student determination in these areas; we're talking about shared authority and maybe that's something I should have underlined and said many times. We're talking negotiations and we're talking about negotiable demands and maybe that really is the basic difference between the past and present. For the first time, we're saying, "We're willing to negotiate." We know that there has to be give and take. We know there has to be compromise. And that to me is the most impressive sign of what maybe many of us have learned in the past. This is the age of compromise, especially in the academic world.

Mental Health Services--we found out at City University that we spent $900,000 in mental health services. Of that, 85% went to salaries. We also found that of all our colleges, six colleges could not even dispense aspirin. What they were doing was putting people on retainers, people that would never go to school except at times when students do not need them. We felt that we were paying them x amount of dollars whether it be $12,000 or $15,000 a year--we'd like to have them on campus a few hours a day on a regularly scheduled basis. I was recently involved in a cartoon which

portrayed an office where you see a pregnant woman, a guy bleeding to death and another person turning green--and you see on the desk, "Doctor's hours - 9 to 9:30 - Mondays and Thursdays."

Number Eighteen would be faculty and administration hiring; having some kind of input in those areas, as well as having, as I mentioned before, a bill of student rights defining what the students' rights are, just like the other components of the campus.

Another area that is very important is student self-awareness. I can't underline that as to its importance.

Also information--gaining information before decisions are reached so students can react to certain things that might affect them and might even add some enlightment to the process of that decision.

These are the areas that we find in this process and we have four major problems.

Number One--apathy--I proposed, and I say this everywhere I go, that maybe what we really need is to bring this to national attention. I proposed to the National Student Association and the National Student Lobby, that I work with, to have national apathy week, sponsored by everybody. I proposed that this be held perhaps in October to give us plenty of time to organize. National Apathy Week would really bring this to a head, really say, "Are we really apathetic or are students really delving into other areas." As I pointed out to one leader, if nobody shows up, we can yell "Success." But apathy can be mentioned in two ways. Apathy, first of all is, "I don't want to be part of the decision-making process because I think things are OK. I go to my classes, I get what I want, I do what I want, and therefore people are running things at the institution the way I want, and therefore I am happy." That's one reflection. The other is a loss of faith or a lack of faith in the institution's ability to change things to their needs. That's the point that I'm most concerned about. Yes, there are students that come and go, especially on our commuter campuses, that are relatively happy that what they get is what they expect or what they expect is what they get. But there is a proportion of students, whether it be 5%, 10% or 15%, that are active. And I would venture to say that, numerically, are probably just as active as that proportion of faculty in those issues that I've just mentioned. Everybody puts down students, but the faculty is to blame, too in many of these areas, as far as committees and things such as that. I'm interested in this loss of faith because I think that's a very important area where people just say, "It ain't going to do it. This mechanism is not going to work." I like to see these things work and I have seen them work.

The second area is tokenism, and also with that gradualism, where people say, "Yes, I believe it but let's try you out; we have a committee of 18 faculty, 42 administrators and we'll put one student on it; and we'll rush out and we'll put on another one the next semester and another, and by 1984"...and that becomes a problem. If students do not feel that they are being effective as a member with or without a vote, then they are not going to have very much faith in this process.

I have sat at all the Board of Higher Education meetings in New York for two years, as I served as the chairman, and I did not have a vote. And yet I felt that

I did just as much if not more without a vote than with the vote. I'm not saying that as a general assumption, but I'm just saying that there are situations where not having a vote is even more important because people feel sorry for you. That also suggests something else, that the power of reasoning may be over the power of vote, if your argument is good enough. Maybe this is a Ralph Nader approach; if you have enough documentation, enough information, you might really be able to convince people without a vote or even without being at the table by issuing a report or a white paper.

We changed around the City University's veterans' program which was non-existent. I happen to be a veteran and noticed that there were no programs really for the veteran two years ago. And we went to the state legislature and got a bill passed, giving us deferred payments, things that no one had thought about, and initiated an entire program through a white paper backed with information that went to all the college presidents, holding them accountable for their estimation of the problem and utilizing that information and putting it into a paper in which we made our recommendations. So far, I would say 42% of our recommendations have been implemented and the rest are being implemented now. So many times you can do things when you have the information.

The third problem is continuity, especially in a two-year college. I'm very aware of that. Everybody says, "Great, you belong here, but how do you provide continuity?" Well, there's no basic answer and I have no magic wand. I can only say that one way to do it is to employ someone. That's a very dangerous thing on the one hand, but yet a very useful thing. In the organization from which I have just returned, we had a professional staff of 4 people full-time and they worked for students. There's always the danger of you having to work for them. But that's true with any kind of organization. I'm sure that trustees can certainly identify with that as well as administrators. But if there are certain guidelines and restrictions, I think it's very important that students must be willing to allocate to make their organizations more viable, those resources that it would require for continuity, which can be provided many times through some kind of official, whether a college-provided official or a person independently employed with student fees.

The fourth area is a new process for collective bargaining. Since we're excluded officially, we're going to be having to find new ways to get back to governance, get back to issues that many students feel important and hold sacred. That's basically the problems as I see them and I hope to speak more on these issues informally or formally. I think this a basic overview of some thoughts that I've seen nationally in regard to governance and collective bargaining.

THE PUBLIC'S INTEREST IN THE GOVERNANCE OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES

by Senator W. Joseph Shoemaker
Chairman, Joint Budget Committee
Colorado State Legislature

I was so flattered by John Mundt's telephone call to participate in this symposium in the state of Washington, particularly when he told me that Senator Sandison had recommended me, that I thought very little about the subject matter of the symposium. Only the words "community colleges" left an impression.

After stalling for time so I could check up on John Mundt and the community college system in Washington, a typical lawyer approach, and finding out from Colorado's counterpart, Dr. Dean Lillie, that both were leaders in America, did I call back and accept--and then ask for information on what I was to be an expert on.

The next communication from John Mundt was a program, listing me as a resource person and the speaker for this dinner get-together on the subject:

"The Public's Interest In The Governance Of Community Colleges."

It was then that I decided to find out about "Governance of Community Colleges." I noted that Dr. Richardson, Mr. Shark and Professor Frankie were also resource persons and were making keynote presentations on the inputs of students, faculty, and administrators into the subject matter.

And I began, for the first time, to feel that I was becoming involved in a family fight. I even began to suspect, and all legislators develop this sixth sense after being burned twice, that I was getting involved as a referee. The one whom the protagonists eventually throw to the lions, the one who walks into a family fight and gets stoned--or at least wishes he were.

Dr. Richardson, on page 57 of his book, "Governance of the Two-Year College," states: "An examination of the quality of human relationships in our colleges today would be sufficient cause for concern. We are experiencing a lack of institutional equilibrium whereby the energy of those involved seems to be expended more in internal conflict than on the objectives for which the organization exists."

But now that I was trapped--and John Mundt must have had my name already on the program when he called me because his written communication, which was the program, came to me by mail one day after I accepted--I decided to do what any legislator would do...find out something about the subject matter. It took me exactly one hour of telephone calls to Dr. Dean Lillie, Dr. Frank Abbott of C.C.H.E., and Mr. Allan Charnes, the director of our Joint Budget Committee staff, to know that I was akin to the preacher who saved all his money to buy a used car--and then didn't have the vocabulary to drive it.

This, ladies and gentlemen, is a dull subject! And speaking about ladies and gentlemen, I have noted in the symposium brochure that you are either a board member, president, faculty member, or student from the 27 community colleges in Washington's so-called system. You are the family!

You're the ones that caused this so-called problem of "Governance." As the chairman of our Senate Committee on Education said: "Are you part of the problem, or are you working on the solution?"

And now you want me to tell you whether the public is interested in your family affair.

Well, I can tell you right off! I'm not! And I'm the public! At least that's what John Mundt would like to have you believe.

It was suggested to me as I lamented my fate on this dull subject that the smartest thing I could do would be to come here in a parka, a la Bert Reynolds, walk up to this microphone, take off the parka, and appear in the nude. You would be so shocked you would remember the Senator from Colorado forever, whereas you'll never remember what I have to tell you on this dull subject.

Can you remember when you and your wife or girl or boy friend - got into it about whether to go to a movie, a dance, or to bed? And do you think your neighbors gave a damn who won?

Can you remember when you and the minister and the elders and the church janitor got into it over whether the floors should be polished every week, or the sidewalks cleared of snow on Saturday night or Sunday morning?

And do you think the Catholics gave a damn?

Do you remember when your state senate got into a fight over who was going to be the majority leader and who should control the budget, the Governor or the legislature?

And did you give a damn?

Do you remember the first four-party partnership organization you belonged to and you and your three partners discussed who was going to write checks, who was going to make the determinations as to new business, who was going to get paid what, based on what performance?

And did your competitors give a damn?

Do you remember the first public corporation you bought stock in, went to the annual meeting, told the president to shape up or ship out, and wondered aloud if the officers weren't draining off the profits with expense accounts so you wouldn't get a dividend?

And did any other corporation give a damn?

Or do you remember the first civic organization you belonged to and someone suggested a nice objective for the Kiwanians would be to meet on Saturday morning in the dry creek gulch so everybody could pick up litter, a worthwhile cause, and only you and two others of a membership of 100 showed up?

Do you think the Rotarians gave a damn?

Or perhaps you belong to the King County Democratic party and you attended your first central committee meeting. The county chairman said the party was going to support the city council, you said let's vote on it, and he said, "Shut up, I'm running this organization as a benevolent dictatorship?"

And do you think the Republicans gave a damn?

Now the point of all these analogies is simply this:

Governance changes but eventually resolves itself as reasonable people finally get together, as you are.

Dr. Richardson states at page 58 of his book: "Public confidence is not so much destroyed by the problems which develop within our institutions of higher education as it is by the evidence that those in responsible positions do not understand the nature of the problems and have not planned for their orderly resolution."

We're all fair-minded people and we want to do what is best for everyone, particularly the organization. But we all, at least those of us who show up at the meetings--and to hell with those who don't--and that's an old political maxim--have a little different approach to "what is best for everyone"--particularly as it applies to us. And we like to have others enjoy the benefits of our advice.

So what happens--the State Board says--"The state's 'Public Interest'--whatever that is--takes precedence over the local public interest. After all, the state puts in the most money, and everyone knows, he who fundeth--runneth." (Or--as I heard in my ten years in the Navy--"Everything flows downhill.")

"So when it comes to governance, we, the State Board, determine state policy--which is everything important--and you, administrators at the state level, carry it out. That's what you're getting paid $35,000 to do."

The local boards say, "We represent the community. We are the people. We know best what's best. If we want bridge playing an accredited course, that's what it will be. Because bridge stimulates thinking--and thinking is educational--and bridge broadens one's objectives in life--and the community college stands for that. After all, education is too important to leave to the educators."

The president says, "I'm in charge. By God this is a Democratic institution and I know what the objectives of this college are because my board told me so--in fact, they even put it in writing--and I'm to carry out the board's policies--whatever they are--on the least possible amount of money because, after all, that's one of the objectives of the legislature, that divine source of knowledge and experience. So faculty members--shape up, make those students learn and don't be caught dead or otherwise at a political rally. Further, watch what you say and don't encourage the student editors of the school paper to print obscene jokes."

In the meantime, the faculty--whatever they are--and I've never known whether they were individuals or whether a union agent spoke for them--say: "We are the re-

source center of this college. We are the natural assets that students come here to mine. The president is a stooge for the board--that lousy bunch of non-educators--and this college is ours. We will set our own pay--by vote of course, in secret--and we will publish because someone once said we would perish if we don't. And when it comes to promotion, we are like the West Point cadets with an honor system--we will decide amongst ourselves who gets promoted--and we don't want any miserable administrator messing up this arrangement. As a matter of fact, we might even strike if we don't get our way, because we don't need this job, we could be making twice as much running the corner laundramat or going back to the farm."

And finally, what do the students say about governance: "After all, without students, what would this institution be? We are the material that will eventually go forth and become legislators and governors, so we have, in the democracy of this institution, the right to demand full professors in every class; no athletic fees; a part-time job that pays all our expenses which allows us to think about important problems of the world, and above all, the right to judge those lousy faculty members, including telling the president which ones should be terminated and promoted; and a hand in setting the policies of this miserable institution. Oh yes, and free tuition. Let those legislators tax the general public."

And what about the general public's interest in governance of community colleges?

It doesn't give a damn.

Just don't air your dirty laundry in public. You don't have half the problems that we do--earning a living, paying taxes--so you miserable bastards can burn down buildings, lead walk-ins, smart off publicly about national affairs, and attend board meetings once out of every three.

Now, lest you think my observations on this dull subject are uneducated, I took time off from skiing one Saturday in January to reflect on what the Greeks might think about a symposium such as this one.

Socrates is quoted as saying (and if you recall, Socrates never in his life put anything in writing - and was executed besides):

"Life unexamined is not worth living."

The Greeks examined life by participating much as you are doing in this symposium. The Greeks considered anyone who did not participate an idiot--that's what I'm sure you consider those of your colleagues who did not show up here.

Two thousand years later, we revere the Greeks no less even if we regard them as human. And they were. Make no mistake about that. They built their Parthenon with misappropriated funds. Slavery tarnished their golden age. They curbed over-population by infanticide, and one of their social security programs consisted of dispensing hemlock to persons over 60.

But the Greeks, not unlike community colleges, were a poor people. They were lacking in most resources except the resourcefulness of man. Greeks borrowed what they needed, across island stepping stones that linked them with Asia and Egypt. For example: the alphabet spared them from memorizing thousands of characters, as the

Chinese do.

Just as resourceful are community colleges. They have latched onto the words "shared governance" which has spared them from having to think about what is their role in post secondary education?

It's easy to criticize the governance of today and to ignore the governance of yesterday, whether it be in community colleges or the presidency of the United States. What would you do differently if you were president of the United States--aside from telling a pun such as: Do you know when President Nixon is lying? Answer: When he opens his mouth.

Seriously, and in conclusion, the public's interest is the same in the governance of community colleges as it is in all public institutions; namely, that those who have an interest act responsibly. And it's expected that before one can govern, he can and has been governed.

Students have a role to play: That is to listen, observe, learn, contribute to themselves and the well being of the institution which gives them such an opportunity. Some day they'll be in charge. But not now!

Faculty have a grave responsibility to take each student as an individual, not as a student number, and do the very best in providing the tools and outlook that will be most beneficial for the student--much the same as a lawyer does for a client, which includes telling a client of a poor position if in fact one exists.

Faculty have a duty to assist the chief administrator in making the college the greatest place of learning within a framework of dignity and decorum--after all their clients are watching. Suggestions and recommendations are constructive, but someone else must answer to the board.

The chief administrator or senior partner has to keep the perspective that the product being sold, as in any law office, is good service, which the faculty provides or should provide to the clients--the students. And, like the encouragement given to any associate or partner in a law firm, the senior partner's success or failure rests with this ability to motivate his colleagues to achieve to greater heights, knowing full well that all individuals have different personal goals and aspirations. Any person in charge knows he must rely on the advice, counsel, and experience of associates.

And the governing board, whether local or state or both, you have come to your role or position, usually by appointment. Your authority, as any authority, is vested in you by virtue of law and precedent. It is your duty to act in the open, to give fair hearing to everyone's view within the reasonableness of time, and to govern in a manner that recognizes facts above all else, that recognizes change, and that realizes that as we learn more, we idealize less.

Marcus Aurelius was quoted as saying: "Men exist for the sake of one another." The great seal of the United States contains a latin phrase: E PLURIBUS UNUM (out of many, one).

Our declaration of independence states that governments derive "Their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Repelled alike by the absolutism of Kings and the despotism of the mob, the French jurist Montesquieu wrote that there can be no exercise of sovereignty but by the will of the people.

Devine indifference in the Greeks bred skeptics, cynics, stoics, epicureans; a philosophical Pantheon of probing, questioning men. They enhanced intellect and gave it such tools as the syllogism, and the theorem. Their inventions were mainly abstract; they left to the Romans the invention of concrete. Surely they would find much that was familiar as they watched us, fallible as we are, wrestle with problems of reconciling freedom with order.

The Constituencies Speak

The Administrators Speak
- Kenneth Aldrich

The Faculty Speaks
- Helen Simon

The Presidents Speak
- Robert Hamill

The Students Speak
- John Postan

The Trustees Speak
- Harriet Jaquette
Betty Mage

Summary
- Frederic T. Giles

THE ADMINISTRATORS SPEAK

by Kenneth Aldrich
Dean of Instruction
North Seattle Community College

I tried to listen to administrators from 26 colleges; 26 different men with 26 different sets of problems and concerns, dealing all the way from serene, docile institutions to urban setups where very high degrees of hostiiity do on occasion exist, so that no way can I come forth and give you any sort of a solidified report from this group, but I'll do the best I can.

The only commonality I can speak of that came from everybody was one of a strong sense of frustration on the part of administrators. He is asking the question, and has been for some time, "Who is he? What is he? What's his role? What's his relationship to the faculty? What's his relationship to his boss?" He needs help from his boss and he needs help from the Board with this question, who he is. He feels a little bad that he's not sure he's everybody's friend, and that bothers him a little bit, too. He's not totally resigned to the fact that that's the way it is.

The suggested questions here for Friday's group meeting--we actually looked at them--normally you throw them out if nobody suggests you think about those things--but we decided we'd look at them. The first thing that one of them noticed is, "Well, here we go again. Look at us--right in the middle--see us, faculty, trustees, administrators, students, presidents--we're right in the middle, as usual. And that tends to be our plight. We think this is a big part of the problem that generates the frustration.

While I'm on the subject, we think we wanted to add something to it. We are aware of the fact that there wasn't the emphasis put on it in this morning's speeches, and that is we think there are some more constituencies to this matter of governance. We think that the classified personnel should be listed there. With considerably less enthusiasm we think that probably we should add the State Board, and even with less yet the State Legislature, as being a part of the constituencies at play in our governance.

This degree of frustration brought forth comments by some people that we ought to organize, we ought to get into some sort of a bargaining unit, not necessarily for purposes of compensation or fringe benefits and working conditions, but maybe to assist us, in some degree, of identity that we don't have at the present time.

We all tended to agree that we enjoyed Dr. Richardson's talk. We enjoyed all the talks but we enjoyed his particularly. It seemed to focus in on some of our problems. We liked his three models. They helped us try to understand a little bit better what the combinations are. We felt, as did Dr. Richardson at the end of his talk, that a combination of these three models, the bureaucratic, the shared authority, and the political model, were not only possible but necessary, and that there are times when each of these models are needed. But once again the question is "Who is to decide when which model is to be in use, and how is it to be put to use? Who makes the decision? OK, are we bureaucratic on this one, do we have shared authority? Is this something for negotiation?" We didn't know.

As was said toward the end of Dr. Richardson's talk, there seemed to be a consensus that administrators don't really understand governance, that of the time that we're together, probably about 80% of that time was spent in heated discussions of collective bargaining, and about 20% on the rest of the subject, which included governance.

Maybe this is because administrators are probably from two basic categories--they are ex-teachers or ex-principals and they grew up under the bureaucracy model and they're more or less used to that. Or possibly they came from the private sector and they're used to working in collective bargaining where in a circular sense, it deals with certain definite issues rather than with the broader issue of what we are talking about here today as governance. Obviously, from just the observations, from the comments, staffing, development on this subject of governance, it is important for the administrator as well as other people. Finally, and with reference to the students, we felt that in spite of Alan Shark's comments on student apathy, that student participation is very important and the points that Alan brought out this morning are vital to the college community.

There is a fear that the legislature is tending to open all aspects of governance to collective bargaining, and this is a fear on our part, which, of course, results in the administration being restricted in its ability to manage. It also has the additional disadvantage that we do not get the total input that we would get through governance.

Referring to Question 5 on the sheet, "Can there be a compromise between cooperative governance and collective bargaining?" We felt, "Yes, there could be, and that there must be." In answer to the question, "Is it desirable to limit bargaining to salary and workload issues and relegate all other issues to a less adversary process," we said, "Very definitely, yes." Except we would change it to say, "Is it desirable to limit bargaining to salary and benefit issues and relegate all other issues to a less adversary process, which, of course, would be the Senate or something similar to the Senate where we would have the participation of students, faculty, classified, Board, and so on."

Finally, in reference to Question 7, "What does the student lose or gain through the process of professional negotiation?," we say that, "To date, in our estimation, and obviously under professional negotiations, I think we are still stumbling and fumbling, as far as we can observe, the gains to the student so far have been minimal." Hopefully, as we mature in this area, they will increase.

THE FACULTY SPEAKS
by Helen Simon
Lower Columbia College

We had a very heated meeting--and it was rather difficult to keep up with it...a lot of people trying to talk at once. We certainly got the impression that there was a strong feeling regarding all faculty members who were present on the subject of governance. To begin with, the group decided not to follow the questions. They felt it would be more advantageous from their point of view if they could be spontaneous and just started off with a wheeling-dealing sort-of approach. We began with concern about the meeting itself. It seemed to be coming from the top down rather than from the faculty up. In fact, some of the faculty didn't even know the meeting was here. They wound up at Sea-Tac instead of at the Benjamin Franklin.

The faculty was somewhat upset by the State Board's opposition to House Bill 1341. We felt that the State Board should have remained neutral on that subject instead of taking a stand against it.

Another point was the realization that governance does deal with budgets. In this respect, the faculty would need to rely on the cooperation of the administration to let them get involved in the budget-making process.

Another point made was that it could be frustrating if governance were coming from Olympia. This would not only be frustrating to the faculty, but to administration and students as well.

We would lose control over our own campus.

Another point is that it might be possible to have governance in the master contract, if there is a master contract on the community college campus as some campuses have. Only by organization, only by collective bargaining--this sort of organization--can you. That was another point that was made.

A question was, "Can collective bargaining be presented in an acceptable way to the Board of Trustees?" This is something we would have to be concerned with.

There were two resolutions passed and we had a very good vote on these. The first one was passed unanimously by the faculty present and the second was passed unanimously with one abstention. The first one is: "We, the faculty, resolve that the State Board for Community College Education fund the faculty-only convention composed of representatives determined by the bargaining agent from each community college campus to discuss key faculty issues." That's the one that was passed unanimously. The second resolution was that, "This faculty group supports collective bargaining as an integral part of the governance process." That was passed unanimously with one abstention.

THE PRESIDENTS SPEAK

by Dr. Robert Hamill
President
Whatcom Community College

This is really a pleasure. I spend most of my time in the president's groups ignoring what the rest say; thinking up what I want to say the next time I get on my feet. Being a recorder for that kind of group in that atmosphere is almost an impossibility.

They did a very predictable thing for a group of people who are used to putting the agendas together--they ignored the yellow sheet--I'm going to keep saying "they" because some of the things that happened I would like to disassociate myself from. Some of the statements are representative of what the group did and said, and some are summaries; some are even consensus. But they are all written in "Hamill-ese" and I take the responsibility for them. In some miraculous fashion the meeting was somewhat organized and the comments tended to fall into three or four groups and so I have regrouped them and tried to put things together. The questions of negotiations had a high priority on our time, and discussion of House Bill 1341, the conviction that it will be up again in April, and that there will be a definite try to get it passed, that we as administrators should take the initiative and get a law that we indeed, can administer. There's absolute agreement that negotiation is here to stay as a process which we will be involved in. What's needed now is a law that is really clear, because there are ambiguities in the present law and I think for some of us there are ambiguities in HB 1341, as it now stands. There is a conviction on the part of some that negotiations, as it turns out in practice on the campus provides a platform for a relatively few faculty members who have gone through the process of becoming the representatives. You frequently get a radical voice, and those most unwilling to approach problems in a rational fashion.

There's kind of a basic question that keeps coming up, that we've got to decide who makes decisions. There are so many forces involved in negotiations right now that it is not clear who stands where in the process. Dave cited 14 agencies which in one way or another, place responsibilities, or absolute responsibilities, in some cases. The legislature is an obvious one, OPP&FM, the Council on Higher Education, the State Board, and on and on. I guess, in that, we share concern with faculty. There ought to be a decision as to, in the negotiations process, where do those people stand?

The comment that it was unfortunate that this meeting was not organized from the bottom up instead of the top down reminds me of the story of the fellow who received two ties from his wife for Christmas. He was delighted and he went right upstairs and put one on, came downstairs and his wife said, "What's the matter with the other one?"

There was a concern and general unhappiness with the terms that we've been using and tossing around; that there needs to be some definitions, a mechanism, maybe, for getting some definitions we can agree on. What is governance? My own personal view if that that's a political term and is not very helpful unless we define it. We've got the Carnegie definition and at least to some of us that seems to not be a useful definition.

The terms "responsibility" and "authority"...how are they related? There is the conviction that there must be a definite relationship between authority and responsibility.

"Accountability"...We, I guess, decided that responsibility and accountability probably mean the same thing, although we didn't take the next step and say, "What are the sanctions if it turns out that you haven't carried out your responsibilities in an acceptable fashion?"

It seems that we ought to distinguish, and I think the speakers this morning tried to do that, between power and authority. We really ought to separate those things that ought to be left in the power arena and some others left in the arena where authority takes over.

Does governance and management mean the same thing? I think there was a conviction on the part of the group that they do not mean the same thing.

Almost all colleges have some form of involvement and participation of both students and faculty in formation of policy and without fear of contradiction I would say there is a wide range of involvement. It must surely mean something different from one campus to another.

There is a conviction that at the present time involvement is not enough, from the point of view of the faculty, that there must be something more than involvement. There was the suggestion that involvement may be, in today's world, considered a right rather than something to be given.

There was a very serious question raised, after some discussion about the number of presidents who over the past few months have seriously discussed retirement,(I guess its kind of a serious thing when you have a significant number of people in any position discussing retirement from the point of view that it isn't much fun or very satisfying anymore.), that we really ought to ask ourselves pretty seriously whether this isn't an ego involvement, that over a period of time there has been such a loss of former status, that maybe that's what it is. We kind of dropped it there because that may be one we ought to go home and examine ourselves. It did remind me of a thing I saw at Christmas when a young friend of mine got a poster to put on his wall that said "Even though you're not paranoid it doesn't mean that they aren't still out to get you."

I want to tell Ken that his concern that everyone didn't love the administrator anymore points up the difference between presidents and other administrators. I think the president's role has been talked about in terms of the ability to live with role ambiguity, and you second-raters haven't learned that yet. It may be a difference between letting frustration give way to resignation--I don't know.

One of the final subjects we discussed, and it came magically as Alan (Shark) appeared at our door, was regarding students. There was pretty good agreement that apathy as it exists among students may very well be a reflection of a lack of faith that getting involved will mean very much. Now, if that's true, then it's something we ought to seriously examine on our own campuses. There is a great potential for power for good. It is rather interesting because we agreed that it was good because of the conviction that probably students and administrators would agree more frequently than not. I think there was essential agreement that students ought to be involved meaningfully in the negotiations process.

THE STUDENTS SPEAK
by John Postan

I'm not really sure, after our conference, that student is any longer the right word to use. There seems to be a role playing that people fall into. If they are administrators they tend to play the role of administrators; the same with faculty, and the same with students in the community college system. So quite often when the student deals with some other member of the college community, this role playing is forgiven. It was formerly thought the student would sit down and ask a question and receive a 15-minute lecture which would consume the entire time for which the appointment was given, walk out and realize that he hadn't really accomplished a heck of a lot. So what we attempted to do was to look at ourselves a little bit also. First of all, we attempted to define "governance." The second question we addressed ourselves to was, "Are we a part of the governance system?" Third, "Do we wish to be a part of the system?" Finally, "To what extent?"...which really answers Question #3...We did say "yes, we did want to be a part."

First of all, define "governance." We really couldn't define it; we had no idea, really. Everyone had an opinion. The literature we had received didn't seem to define it. I didn't feel any strong objectives for us to get after. Goals were not set out. Then, on the other hand, maybe that was the intent--to have a free-running forum, seek new ideas, plan for the next one, and have something more specific to deal with.

Are we part of the governance system? Again, the answer is "yes," as we saw it, but it is qualified "yes." We're part of it by virtue of tokenism. We're all pretty well aware that we've been patronized for a long time. Catch phrases come readily into mind..."The faculty and administration are here forever. The students are a faceless blob that moves through; really have no stake in the campus except for an interim period of time. Then it's gone." What this means is that "our paychecks are here." It's not nice to ask for the man's paycheck.

At any rate, we want to be part of the system, and to become involved in an attempt to change it. That was the unanimous answer. Alright, to what extent do we want to become involved?

100%...Why?...to affect the quality of education. We are, after all, the consumers; the students, we aren't something you remember from grade school or high school, we aren't a student, we aren't principals, but we want to be the consumers for the education we wish to influence.

Some of the ways we looked at this--how could we offer something constructive, offer something positive?--was by dealing with some of the questions of administrator responsibility. "Do we wish to be an active part of that responsibility or to serve as an advisor in that area?" Again, we didn't come up with a fast answer. We're looking for a debatable issue, something that we can examine for some pros and cons, and probably something positive. So we really don't have fast answers.

We think we would like to have the right to advise on any student issues. That's very important to us. We've been told over and over again that we did have that right. But again, it reflects back to certain areas of tokenism. We would like to see some end of patronization. A man, no matter how old he is when he is a community college student,

no matter what his experience or background is, when he talks to a faculty or administrative representative, he becomes a student immediately. No matter how old he is, he remembers what it was like to be a student, he plays that role just as well as the younger student. We tried to approach the problem of, "is there continuity in a two-year college?"

Again, no fast answers. What is the quality of education? No fast answers to that, either. What I think it boiled down to was that we decided this is an excellent idea--the Governance Conference, and perhaps it should be done a little more frequently. I realize that's expensive, but it doesn't have to be on this grand a scale. At any rate, the student leaders would like to see something like this, where there is an opportunity, perhaps on a quarterly basis, to get together. We can keep in touch in between times. But at least once a quarter, let us all get together and say, "What's our progress? What is for greater progress?" We must measure that. To do that, of course, we must have some goals. One general goal we selected is from the yellow sheet, Item No. 5, that is; Can there be a compromise between cooperative governance and collective bargaining? That is something we would like to set up as a goal and define as quickly as possible, and make a determination.

Finally, since students are what they are, education consumers with all the rights of a consumer, we decided that, to help you work with us we would like to let you know one thing that we all agree on, a short statement which is: "To share in the authority and the responsibility on those points upon which we agree; and where we disagree, people negotiation rights on any issue that affects the persons who avail themselves to community college education programs." That is really a brief summary for a relatively short meeting where everyone participated, and felt it was a positive step toward cooperating with you.

THE TRUSTEES SPEAK
by Harriet Jaquette
Bellevue Community College

I am privileged to be up here with this panel, and I would like to make a comment to Ken Aldrich when he talks about the strong frustration of the administrator. "Who am I?" Then he says, "I'm right in the middle." That's easy, there's trustees to tell him what to do; there's faculty and classified staff to do it for him, and there he sits. As chairman of the trustees group, I have this yellow sheet but I carefully ignored it because the trustees had so much to say. But then as you know, it was impossible to bypass some of the trustees, because when they're on target, they're ready to go, and we did at the tail-end review the yellow sheet. To the student, when you talk about role playing, I'm very sympathetic because I know, as a trustee, I have one hat on, but I always hope that I will be a student, forever learning some of the things that we need as trustees.

We had a very rigorous, active, concerned group of trustees. There were 19 local trustees and 2 State Board trustees. I did ask the trustees and the State Board trustees to identify the issues they see as critical to governance. Then we would speak to some positive suggestions regarding how the governance process might be improved in our community college system. Each one was truly a deep concern for his or her college, and a devotion to the community college system.

Betty Mage
Clark College

As I present these concerns expressed by the trustees, I would like to think of them in terms of challenges, because I think that's in reality what they are. Then I will review some of the suggestions we have, what we believe are positive suggestions for dealing with these challenges.

First is the breakdown of communications which can be limited to the collective bargaining process. Communications from trustees to the faculty can become biased or prejudiced, we believe, through this process. Collective bargaining can become game-playing, rather than what is good decision-making for the institution.

Trustees, perhaps, should develop a collective bargaining bill. Trustees need to maintain, and we all do, a trusting relationship among and between constituencies not only on our local campuses but between the local and the state level of the system. Trustees have a responsibility to the public and are the voice for the community.

Classified staff, in reality, have been swept under the rug, through the creation of the HEP Board and the challenge is to find a viable input in the process for this group of people.

There is concern about the shared governance between local and state trustees. This must be recognized and resolved. The demands from the state on the local institution by means of defensive documentation for what we're doing; concern at a challenge about the power of what appears to be, and is this truly representative of the local boards.

Formal evaluation for administrators, erosion of local autonomy, apathy on the part of the trustees, citizen advisory groups making recommendations to the state legislature without consultation or participation on the part of local and state trustees...

Our positive suggestions, I would like to note, were recorded in the way they were related in the group, and I think this is significant. The first suggestion as a positive means for resolving some of these challenges: that there should be and must be evaluation of trustees as a step for improving the governing process. We should evaluate the effectiveness of the trustees as a group and we should evaluate the effectiveness of the trustees as invididuals in that group process.

There should be annual sessions or meetings of the constituents serving the colleges at the local level. There should be annual meetings with local boards serving the K-12 program within a given community college district with the board of trustees serving that district.

We need to have an open door to the business manager's office.

Trustees should seek out classified staff input.

Student input should be encouraged, but even more important, that participation and input should be meaningful. Trustees do not want the collective bargaining process to be the only means of communication with the faculty, and students involved with the students. Trustees want a clear decision-making mechanism understood by all the constituents.

SUMMARY

by Frederic T. Giles
Professor and Dean of Education
University of Washington

At this point I have listened to three speakers, I have attended most of the sessions, I have listened to the discussions here, and have heard the questions. I feel that I am about as necessary at this particular point as the social director on the Titantic. Perhaps, I could wind it up a little bit by telling an anecdote which seems to fit at least all I've learned today. It's about a 747 that left Seattle not long ago for Japan, a non-stop trip, but it had gotten out beyond the point of no return and the pilot came on and said he was very glad to have everybody aboard, he had some bad news and some good news to report. The bad news was that they had lost all of their directional and navigational equipment, they were hopelessly lost and all the communication equipment was out. The good news was that they had a good tail wind and they were ahead of schedule. As I listened to all the things about governance, I thought maybe this group was about in that same particular position. I am going to say a few things that relate to some words. I really don't know what I think about what I heard today until I hear what I have to say about it. It's very difficult, to do this. I heard so many problems with definitions, terminologies. So what I really am going to do is pick out words I heard over and over again, or I heard used in different ways. Definitions and terminologies seem to get in the way of really discussing the issues, because we think we're talking about the same thing, but we're not.

I thought that the major shortage in Seattle was gas, but today I found out that the major shortage in Seattle was trust and faith. At all the places I went, this kept coming up. Whether it was said or not, there was an inference if only somebody else would do something or if somebody else would let me do something, or somebody else would not have done something...

The second most useful term that was heard, and of course this has been going on during all the time I've been involved in education and elsewhere, was the feeling of communication; there doesn't seem to be any communication. I've come to the supposition that communication is not what most people think it is. Communication is a feeling rather than some act that somebody goes through. The feeling is that people think they have been communicated with only in those times in which they have been communicated in the way they want to be communicated with, about the things they want to be communicated with. They have that feeling afterwards. If you don't get it first hand, if that's the way you want it, it doesn't make any difference how many times you've heard it--you haven't been communicated with. Now, this is a problem. There's no question about it.

I would say to you you don't have the feeling of being communicated with or you think this is one of your major concerns and certainly you're not alone.

Another issue that came up, and I'll try to put this in a slightly different context than what has been recorded, was the frustration that seems to arise because of the widened scope of potential participants in governance. I counted up that if you have both the vertical expansion internally within a campus between the potential participants, and the horizontal expansion between the campus and the external places with legislators, councils on education, etc.--you end up with something like 21 that you

get involved that are potential participants in some kind of governance or administration. And you can make a score card yourself as to how many you are involved with and whether all want to be at the same level or whether they can be. But, there is this frustration or concern I think about the widening of a process.

I picked up from the various groups, the business of accountability and responsibility. Is there a difference in who one is accountable to or responsible to? Are there times when there will be unresolvable conflicts for which some priority has to be established as to which part of the conflict is going into effect based upon who the responsibility is to, or whether it can be done always in an open conference with the conflict being resolved without concern about this.

Another one was the idea that all concerns, all problems, all activities, all policies, all implementation may need not require the same administrative and governance structure process for everything that you do. I think this has been talked about again this afternoon. Can you be select? Do you have to have everything run through the same machinery--everything. Or are there ways of administering and governing in order to make it possible for things to happen, rather than having governance in the position of keeping things from happening.

There seems to be confusion between what I could call a recommending authority and a final authority that's been given through some kind of rule, regulation, law or something else. These are not necessarily synonomous. There are times which the authority that one has is recommending. If everybody accepts it up the line or down the line or across the line, it operates as though the person who had recommending authority had final authority because it was all accepted without any change or veto.

There seems to be a mixing, as far as I'm concerned, and I thought the speaker this morning did a fantastic job of attempting to lay the ground work on the difference between administration, governance structure and process. But again, it seemed to me that these got put together in either some unilateral concept or someway got so mixed up that it was difficult for people to respond to them. They saw them in mixed models or discreet models. I picked out from one conversation, "Governance...if we don't have it, I don't think we want it"...the kind of attitude that this was something that you bought or didn't buy, that you had to decide you were going to have, forgetting that the place is going to be run, there is going to be governance, things are going to happen, regardless of how you get it organized.

Under all this is that there has to be structure and organization of some kind, either given or informal, different for everything that happens, there is some kind of structure.

The important thing, it seems to me is that regardless of the structure or the organization is the fact that its going to be people who operate it. The people and their perceptions are the energizers of any kind of structure or organization that you set up. And anybody can keep any kind of machinery from not functioning. It seems to me that it is the people then, that we have people business rather than a lot of other business, and we get organized for governance for other kinds of things.

We talked about negotiations, of consensus, collegiality; it seems to me that these are the energies, the methodologies that we use to make structures work. Frequently, I hear people talking about goals, but I didn't really hear as much about what the way is that we can go about making the business that we have at hand, that of community college education, work better, function better and end up with better education.

Because this is the business--that's why we try to organize. Again, I come back to the fact that in organizations elsewhere, the flavoring, the thing that makes it palatable, that makes it work is trust and faith, the part that has to go into this for any organization to go. Structures don't solve governance problems by themselves. People do. I think most people understood this and recognized it, although they were concerned about structure.

Can all things be compromised, was a question that was asked. Can all things in the education world be compromised--or are there certain kinds of things that don't lend themselves to some kind of middle-ground compromise like objective things that relate to numerical or other things. Are there some given things that have to be held that may come from any source that's involved in the process. Also, can we assume that frequently the means get confused and become more important than the end, the reason for which we're doing things. We do get ourselves tied up in governance participation and have means as goals, and the means by which we get there become of prime importance and we feel successful if we can establish or get across something that relates to that.

There's a lot said about power and authority, and less said about influence than I thought. The student speaker this morning indicated that maybe one of the greatest sources that students or perhaps anyone else has is influence, and however they manipulate or use their talents in order to get ideas across. But, power, authority and influence once in a while seemed to be referred to the idea that if you had it and used it properly, you got your own way. It seems to me that isn't necessarily always true.

I would say that this has been a marvelous discussion; that the big job ahead is to be able to raise one's sights, raise discussion to a more conceptual level relative to the problems, concerns and issues that relate to the operation at all levels and in all ways in the community colleges; to try to look upon decision-making not as a single act, but as a process that can be charted, that can be worked out, that can be layed out. Frequently, I find that where we get into trouble is that we think of it as some sort of a one-time act, like stamping "good", "choice" or something on meat; if you don't have your hand on the stamp, you're not involved, you haven't participated, the decision-making is outside, where you may have a great amount more influence or more authority other than that one act.

Again, I would like to compliment the three speakers this morning, because I thought they really did what they were being asked to do. They gave a framework, a conceptual framework that did an excellent job. I would also indicate that from what I listened to people talking about, because they got it at a different level, that most people are really concerned about the same things. They may be concerned about how to do them in a different way, or their role in doing them in a different way. There is great similarity in concerns that may come out if one looked at this. I always think of the story they tell about the fellow whose sign said, "Julius Schmidt, Chinese Laundry." They could never figure out why, "Julius Schmidt, Chinese Laundry." So finally one fellow asked him how this happened. "Well, I came to this country, I came through Ellis Island and you had to be processed. The fellow ahead of me, they asked questions--'What's your name, where are you from.' The fellow said he was Julius Schmidt. Then they asked me what my name was and I said 'Sam Ping' and ever since that time I've been Julius Schmidt.

Frequently people are really talking about the same things here. The way to get there may be different because of the place from which one comes in relationship to governance. So I would hope that whatever processes you people go through, you can go from these steps by identifying concerns and issues; that you would be able to move to

some kind of positive program-approach in which you look upon problem-solving in a variety of step-ways, in a systematic way, to be able to identify some concerns that are concerns of all, to be able to collect data, information and everything about that one can find; that you could develop the alternative ways one might go in order to arrive at the kind of governance system or the way of making decisions; that you would also take the next step to be able to figure out the consequences if you moved in any one of these directions, because it isn't just the alternative that is important, it's the consequence. Then I would add to that, the next step that seems to me is awfully important because most decisions on how one does things and how one moves are based upon value judgments that come out of the process, or are based upon the value judgments of the kind of consequences that one can accept at a given point in time. So it seems to me that tomorrow, and for the future, there seems to be plenty to do. You have a good start. I think you're indebted to the people this morning who started you off; at least in getting to the framework in order to talk about governance.

Reflections

RICHARD C. RICHARDSON, JR.

RICHARD J. FRANKIE

ALAN R. SHARK

W. JOSEPH SHOEMAKER

REFLECTIONS
by Richard C. Richardson, Jr.

I have heard some of the most articulate student statements it has ever been my good fortune to listen to. An important resource but I hope not viewed so much as an ally in internal battles as a voice within and outside the system calling for more commitment to the goals all share.

At times, I have heard faculty and presidents make statements that sounded as if each felt it might be possible to improve their position somewhat at the expense of the other. I think I heard, also, recognition of some interdependencies that bind all constituents together, as well as a growing awareness that competition for the highest point on the boat ought to give way to an arrangement where everyone can lend a hand to manning the pumps. I found among both groups a sincere commitment to some common goals. I found much less evidence of a willingness to credit the other party with honorable intentions. In short, each group seems to feel its personal goals are based on a sincere desire to promote an improved quality of education while concluding that the other is pursuing selfish interests. I'm sure the truth lies somewhere between and probably is worth discovering so that it can form a basis for more honest communication and cooperation.

I found the same tensions between campus and state office personnel that I have observed in other states such as Connecticut, North Carolina, and Minnesota where there exist state systems funded by state legislatures. I have found in such systems a reluctance on the part of administrators and faculty to become involved in meaningful problem solving at the campus level because of uncertainty about the extent of campus decision-making authority. I have seen the opposite side of the coin also and am convinced that the individual college will never feel that it has all of the autonomy it needs as long as the system continues in existence. While the centralization - decentralization argument can never finally be resolved, a clean definition of campus and system responsibilities could reduce the degree of insecurity of college staff members and create an improved climate for cooperative interaction.

I heard some suggest that the process of definition could be applied to college problems also, to identify the issues with which each constituency should be primarily concerned. I would urge you to be very careful about the degree of reliance you place on this approach. The situation determines who is interested in what issue, and interest determines who participates. No issue can ever be permanently assigned to one group or, for that matter, to either the college or the state system. It is better to design problem-solving procedures that are open to influence when interest is high but which can function without involvement when the opposite condition prevails.

In this regard, I would like to suggest to you what I believe to be one of the most significant techniques available to institutions and systems. That concept is conditional decision-making. Since most decisions in areas involving college operation are not controversial, they can be made by administrators with the understanding that if one is really blown, it can be referred to an alternative solution through a governance procedure. But things should never be referred to a governance procedure as a matter of form unless that's the only way of getting them done appropriately.

The concept of conditional decision-making applies not only to administrative

responsibilities, but also to committees. If we identify a series of related issues that are important enough to merit the appointment of a standing committee, the decisions of that committee should be final, subject to the right of designated staff members to challenge the committee decision when it seems unsound. It is terribly patronizing to faculty and students to appoint them to a standing committee and then to stress that they are advisory in nature and that they are appointed only to make recommendations to the president. You can achieve the same results by designating committees as having decision-making authority, and then reserving the right to challenge decisions for good reasons. This method does work and does not compromise the accountability of the president.

The argument of accountability is often used as a justification for retaining all decision-making authority at the level of the president. You need to be aware that this is a fundamental cause of the lack of trust which several people commented upon yesterday. When a president says, "I am accountable, therefore I must make the final decision," what he is really saying is, "I don't trust my subordinates or the faculty to make decisions on which I am prepared to be evaluated." Lack of trust breeds lack of trust. The union movement and the detailed and lengthy contracts which I reviewed last night say quite clearly, "I don't trust administrators to make any decisions in areas that affect me." If you want to find the source of distrust that concerns you, you need look no further than these mutually-related proclamations of distrust and their continuing fall out.

For accountability is multi-directional. Whenever a relationship exists, whether defined in law, spelled out in a contract, or simply a product of common involvement in a mutual enterprise, there is two-way accountability. Teachers cannot teach unless students learn and administrators maintain the integrity of the institutional operation. Trustees can carry out their legal responsibilities only with the cooperation of those they employ and those that are served. Each relationship carries with it behavioral expectations. It is these expectations that constitute the basis for judging accountability. The expectations that are not defined in writing are just as important as the ones that are. A failure to live up to expectations provokes corresponding failure in the other party to the relationship. For example a failure by administrators or faculty to respect the professional integrity of the other will inevitably lead to behavior which justifies this lack of trust.

Finally, I am constrained to agree with Senator Shoemaker on one significant point. The public and the legislature really don't give a damn about the games we play in the name of governance. They are not paying for governance, they are paying for education. Unfortunately, they tend to judge the quality of the educational process by the statements we make about each other--since they can't observe any changes in the students--and by the extent to which we seem committed to a common goal. The public is bound to lose confidence in us if we have no confidence in each other. We cannot diminish one another without harming our total enterprise. In an era of stress, we may not be able to afford the luxury of family quarrels.

In this conference, in addition to some of these problems that I've identified, I've also seen a mutual reaching out. People who have for good reasons, developed a fund of distrust, at least opened themselves to listening to what other people have to say. I would that this conference would serve, as John Mundt said yesterday, as the point from which some continuing efforts might be made by this system to restore confidence in each other, and through that, the public's confidence in the entire system.

REFLECTIONS
by Richard J. Frankie

I was a little distressed yesterday in terms of how we went into such a quandry over definitions. So, I went to my notes just to get us off to some point of departure and found a bulletin that had been sent out from Berkeley that was written by Bud Hodgekinson who later put out a book called Power and Authority and then another one called Governance and Factions - Who Decides Who Decides. This is what he said about governance as this commission was formed at the Center for Research at Berkeley. "The basic question underlying our study is, What is the nature of governance? Is it organization charts, is it committees, or is it protest or decision-making? The thesis of the study, of course, is that governance is many things; informal channels as well as formal channels, reason as well as emotion, individuals as well as groups, persuasion as well as power, decisions made as well as decisions avoided. Governance deals with the problems perceived by those who have some connection with the campus."

I think it is very appropriate for our meeting today, as we discussed so much about governance but didn't zero in on the definition, I think it is very crucial that governance certainly deals with the problems perceived by those who have some connection with our community college campuses.

I mentioned yesterday that we have some degree of a process of antagonistic cooperation. I must say that in our group, particularly as we focused on faculty roles, our group had a certain sense of antagonism and tension. But as the late Martin Luther King said: "Out of our discussion which started out with a feeling of a certain degree of threat," (all the faculty present indicated that they had been co-opted, that they had not participated in planning, and that what was the purpose for this very reason of all the various segments and elements) but as the group gathered, all these academicians, I saw, as Martin Luther King said, "a certain creative tension that built up." And central to this discussion was this whole focus on collective bargaining. So I thought I might share a few comments from Bud Hodgekinson's book (which I commend to all of you on this whole area of power and authority) as there were several terms used yesterday and one seemed to have a good handle on what we meant by government, governance, power, influence. I think Dean Giles mentioned, "What are these resources of influence that various people bring to bear."

One of the chapters had to do with Ray Howe's paper on faculty roles, so I thought I might just excerpt some quotes to think about in terms of discussion for today that grew out of our discussion about faculty roles and the fact that this group of 20 or 25 even came to a consensus and some resolutions in regards to this very crucial process of collective bargaining. Ray Howe said: "It's long been recognized by most of those in the field that there has been a sense of alienation of teaching faculty from administration, and perhaps even vice-versa. It may be characterized as a kind of a cold war of long standing, and it's now becoming increasingly hot." As a visitor meeting with this group, I must say that our discussion got increasingly hot. He went on to write: "Of course the radical change in our society serves only to accentuate the tension. If conflict-reducing and tension-relieving mechanisms are either necessary or desirable, why can we not call upon the traditional mechanisms and expect reasonably and confidently that theywill suffice. This was the first predictable reaction to the specter of collective bargaining, especially evident in the community college."

He goes on to quote some aspects from John Livingston who was active in faculty senates in California. Ray then wrote, "Collective bargaining will come only when *and if the faculty asks for it. In an increasing number of states where enabling* legislation has been enacted, it must come if faculty so choose."

I must say that our faculty that met yesterday seemed to come very strongly in that direction, that they are choosing to have collective bargaining.

Ray then wrote: "I think faculty members need no external stimulus to organize themselves to relate to administration save that provided by the temper of the times. Faculty may desire an alternative to the current course; but if such an alternative is to have any hope of acceptance, it must possess two basic characteristics--strong organization and direct group action. No substitutes for these characteristics are likely to be allowed. Currently, union-like pursuits offer them, and faculty body after faculty body is finding it relatively often amazingly easy to turn its back on the unions of professionalism in favor of the reality of power."

I would think today, as we reflect on the actions of yesterday that I would anticipate that this would be an aspect that these faculty groups--whether they are AAHE, or affiliated with AFT, or AHE or Teamsters--look at very hard, in terms of developing their resources and influence.

Another topic that came up is the area of government. Dick Richardson's book has an excellent chapter with his co-author John Mallet from Ohio, who was Chancelor of the board of regents as they moved into their statewide coordinating board, and a former president, and professor of political science. He is now vice-president of the Academy of Educational Development in Washington working with Al Youik.

I thought I might conclude my remarks with some comments by John Moleski from a speech that he gave on "Government in the American Colleges and Universities" at the University of Toledo. He said, "As I have already observed, government is ordered and ruled. Government involves purpose, organs of decision-making, administration, and financing. If there is to be a new constitution for the government of the college, such a constitution will have to provide a framework of processes responsive to these four requirements."

I think what this group is suggesting is change; change in the involvement of students, changes in terms of this mechanism for faculty, changes in academic staff, which is a very important part of our academic community.

He said: "The administration element in our colleges has possessed the power of government because it did provide in the past a sense of purpose, an effective mechanism for decision-making, an administrator aparatus, and some direction for financing the college enterprise. If faculties and student bodies are now to assume a greater role in the government processes of the colleges, then these groups must develop some sense of objective to be realized, an effective mechanism of decision-making, some method for directing the administrative aparatus for operation of the college, and last but not least, a financial program."

REFLECTIONS
by Alan R. Shark

When I got up this morning, and tried to decide about some reflections, I realized that really what I did yesterday was to reflect. So, I can really reflect upon what I reflected.

Not too long ago, I was in the State of Oregon. One of the student body presidents raised his hand and he said: "I have a problem."

I said, "Well, what is it?"

He said, "I'd like to talk to you about it afterward."

I said, "Well, maybe the question you have might be answerable to the student body here."

He said, "I don't think so, it's kind of personal." And I was trying to think--I knew this guy was from the University of Alaska--and I don't know too much about Alaska, so I was wondering what his major problem was because he looked quite concerned. Finally, I said, "Well, what is it, you've got to tell me what it is."

He said, "Well, I don't know if you know about university language; I said, "no I don't." He said, "Well, we're a commuter campus and we have a hell of a lot of apathy." I cannot underscore the importance of the concern for apathy, and getting students to become involved.

Yesterday, we spoke about the two major areas: One: We can assume everything is going well. I certainly would like to think that, many faculty would like us to think that, many administrators would like us to think that. I really would like to think that, that we could just go to school to learn, and perhaps not take part in that decision-making process. But I disagree very strongly with Senator Shoemaker, and I know he has the last say and I would be happy to hear his response, when he mentioned the limiting effects of student influence or student role in the decision-making process. That was one point that I was almost ready to jump up but since his jokes were so good, I kept quiet.

There is a loss of faith in the system but I think that the academic campus provides the greatest experimental territory for this kind of thing, for the exploration of faith in a system. Since we are using the word "governance" and we are using the word "Senates," we are using very interesting governmental terms. It is a very artificial type setting. It's an artificial community of interest. However, since this is an artificial setting and it is a condition of learning, I think that students really must play a more important role in the decision-making process. Students should be concerned not only about how the process influences or affects them, but equally how they may influence or affect the process.

Now, I heard a few words here in the last 24 hours and it sounds like something from a thesaurus. The word "interest;" we certainly got the word "interest" roused, when we started talking about it, and shared the word "interest" in concerns of each of the constituencies. We used the word "empathy," when we can say that one might be able to emphathize with another, though I'm not sure how far we went in that area.

We used the word "sympathy." Maybe that was more reflected in students than anybody else. We used the word "concern." We were concerned about all the components and influences and effects that we're talking about. We used the word "understanding," where we made an attempt to understand each of the different constituencies. We used the word "respect," which I think is extremely important. We used the word "willingness," which is even more important, because that kind of suggests action. We used the word "consensus," we used the word "commitment," and we used the word "action." And it's that last word I think is the most important. When I spoke yesterday I said there are really three phases of governance. One is the beginning when you formulate a charter. Second, when you create the body; and thirdly the body creates the functional components which might be the committees. I like to think of this symposium as the charter, the beginning. One way to reflect the commitment that I see around here, might be to start an ongoing commission out of this body to really investigate governance, to put the commitment into the form of guidelines or some kind of statement of policy to reflect that, so that we have the next step. I would like to see the next step.

Whenever I'm meeting a student body, I always set the next date. That's one way of setting the next agenda, and that's certainly something to think about.

The major problem affecting students is student organization. That is one thing I did not get to yesterday and I know that with the two minutes that I have I really cannot get into that. But that is a major problem, especially in the community colleges where you have a problem of continuity. I suggested that we think about having staff and student groups working with them or for them, whether it be part-time or full-time; and also phasing in and phasing out student governments so you don't have a total change-over at one period of time.

Every student government that I visit across this country has one basic scenario which really upsets me. That is, there is always a student body president who has a vice-president or a coup against him, and a coup against the coup, and a coup against the coup against the coup. Also on that same campus, there's a problem on which they feel the constitution is not operating. I could collect something that would resemble the Encyclopedia Britanica for one year of just student constitutions that were thrown out across the country. But every year we have new student governments, and if a guy makes it from one point to the other, he should be congratulated if he's not impeached or threatened to be impeached. If the constitution can survive two semsters or two academic years, that constitution should be saved and cherished. Maybe even framed. And yet, every student group thinks that this is only their problem. I always have to reassure people. They always feel good when they come around; I tell them that they're not the only ones, they're not alone, that their problems are everybody else's problems. It means it's not unique here in the State of Washington, it's not unique in the State of New York or in the middle of Kansas--it's everywhere. It kind of means that maybe there are some basic solutions that we can start looking at. It's conferences like these that inspire me to go in those kind of directions. And, that's why if we can get that kind of commitment to move on, what's the next step, the next state, what's on the agenda; that certainly would make me feel a lot happier; and these student groups, because this is what students really need.

When it comes to definitions, we do get very complicated. I had my staff prepare a glossary of governance terms. And, I would just like to share with you fifteen terms of influence in the form of participation to show you how complicated things get. You have the term, "participatory democracy," and we have the term "participatory membership," we have the term "procedural democracy," "procedural membership," we have

"presence," we have "continuous presence," we have "non-continuous presence," we have "continuous membership," "non-continuous membership," "participatory input," "participatory role," "advisory role," "consultative role," "tokenism," and no participation at all. As I said yesterday, we can devise all of the most beautiful documents in the world. As I walked into Hunter College in the City University of New York I found 200 screaming adults saying: "This is the plan that we drew up?" One thing that certainly strikes home to me is that no plan or no system of governance can be derived or accomplished until we accomplish one major goal--and that's with a capital "F"--and that's faith. Unless we can derive the faith of different constituencies, no plan is going to work on any campus, and any system. Maybe that's our major goal--faith and understanding.

REFLECTIONS
by Senator W. Joseph Shoemaker

I'd like to take off from where Mr. Shark left off. I'd like to have you thinking about what's good for your college, because I think every thing we're talking about, in the final analysis, relates to what's good for your college. I'll tell you that that's how I look at it from the legislative standpoint, and that's more or less what my reflections are going to be, because I think a symposium like this is good too. I don't think there's been enough controversy. I haven't seen anybody punch anybody in the nose yet. I don't think unless you bring out all the things that are bugging you, you have a chance to really come to some kind of a consensus.

The committee that I chair in the legislature, the Joint Budget Committee, as far as I'm concerned everything turns on my funding, financing, whatever you want to call it--budgeting; in the final analysis, that's what everybody's competing for. We hear the budgets of all 27 institutions of higher learning in Colorado--ranging from the University of Colorado through the state college systems, to the community college system. We hear each president and his group come in and make a presentation. This particular year, we took our budget hearings out to each one of the individual institutions so that the students and faculty could be there and could hear what we did to that college president. When he got done making his budget presentation, and we got done asking our questions, they all came up and hugged him because they said "We didn't know what sons of bitches you were putting up with." They saw how that legislative group is, and for the first time, I think, they understood what that college president was up against, because they thought he hadn't been making a case for their particular point before. And, in each one of our hearings, we gave whoever wanted to from the student body or the faculty a chance to stand up and say what they had on their minds. We learned a lot from that too. As a matter of fact, we're making a very significant change in our tuition policy because of what the students of Colorado State University came up with in terms of how they thought it was unfair or not right that we were charging indirect costs into the tuition money. We're going to change that on account of the work that that group did.

In my analysis, I think the faculty is the most important thing in an institution of higher learning. Now, wait a minute until you've heard the rest of it. In order to try and come to what the facts are, what the issue is, I have listened and listened--and this is particularly true of legislators, they do everything but get to the issue, or they do everything except talk about the facts; they're as emotional as anybody else--until you can get down to the fact--what's the problem--what are the solutions to the problem, how do you know at the end of a given point in time whether you've solved that problem.

We budget more and more and it's tough because it takes more and more time. I spend six months out of the year, $35 a day--and my hourly rate goes for $50 as a lawyer, but I only do it because I like it. I like being a legislator. I'm on the budget committee and I've been on it for 12 years--ever since I've been in the legislature--because all the issues finally come to us. Our six person committee debates with ourselves on everything. We don't have unanimity on our committee, but we do have a system that if the vote is 3-3, it's no vote, but if it's 4-2 that's the position of the budget committee so everybody else doesn't tear us apart, because everybody else is against the budget committee. But I'm saying that we still try to boil it down to what is the issue.

In terms of budgeting for a college, I can tell you, the college that comes forward, proud of themselves, and with a good program for those students, is the one that's going to get the money. We have a commission on higher education that reviews all the budgets and we have the board of community colleges which reviews all the budgets. So by the time the college president gets in front of us, he's been pretty well screened up to that point. So we have a way of saying, "Is there anything you asked for that you didn't get from all these others?" That puts him between a rock and a hard place, because he doesn't know whether or not he should really say. He doesn't know whether he should really let it be known that this board cut him back or the commission cut him back. We encourage him to do it on the basis that there very well could be something that he wants to emphasize that we would be willing to fund if he shows that he's got his facts and that it's going to accomplish something.

Out of the 200 budgets we hear, for about six a year we'll give the administrator more money than either one of the other parties had cut him down to. Whether you call it a bonus or an additional way of funding, he understands that he might be, if he makes a good case, going to get some more money. I'm saying the reason I think the faculty is the most important thing is because they are the lawyer. They're the ones that are rendering service, and a service is being rendered for the benefit of the student, who is the client. And the reason, and I'll answer Mr. Shark's question of me, the reason why I think you have to be practical about the role of the student unless you've got a bunch of professional students who are around who are going to be the spokesmen of the student--if you're talking basically about a four-year student, my experience--and I've got a girl who is a senior at the University of Colorado, a son who is a freshman, and two more coming along--my experience is, the first year they just get their feet on the ground if they're lucky. The second year they begin to decide what they want to do academically, and maybe it's the third year that they feel they have the time that they can take part in the student movement, the student input, the student role, and so forth. By the time they become of the quality of the students who have been here today, stand up and be spokesmen, they're about ready to graduate. So from a practical standpoint, they're going to go on, and somebody else has got to come along. That is not like that college president or that board of trustees, or those faculty members, who are going to be here and here and here, and on and on and on. It's not fair that the student is on the same basis as somebody else, because he's not, as far as I'm concerned. I think that the more the students have developed the case the better they are. I was very impressed by the homework that the students had done here yesterday.

I'd just like to conclude by saying this: I think that the impression you people make with your legislators is the single most important thing. It's sort of interesting that there aren't any legislators from Washington here, but, maybe that was on purpose; maybe it was because you wanted to have your in-house thing without bringing the legislature in.

I think the only way you have a hand in getting to the solution of the controversy is to get right to the controversy and understand the emotions that are involved. When I attended the faculty meeting yesterday, I heard somebody say that the only reason this conference was being held is because John Mundt is running for United States Senator and I knew that's the way that people think. And, that's understandable because people have a way of relating an issue to a personality.

But I found out the hard way that you don't win ball games on personalities. You don't really win ball games in taking on a personality, because you have taken away some of your own power by getting off of the issue. And, besides I don't think that, by and large, the constituents appreciate getting into personalities. You've got to stick to the

issue, and if you do that, make your case to the legislature. I believe Washington is the same as Colorado in that in the final analysis the legislature is going to decide. I think that's right in Washington. I know that's right in Colorado, I'll tell you it's damn well right in Colorado. The legislature is going to resolve it in the final analysis and that's what we're elected to do. There's 135 in the senate and 65 in the house, and in the final analysis the people have the say-so about us.

So, as you get the experience of meeting together I would buy that suggestion all the way. I would even suggest, as I heard in the faculty yesterday, that the faculty have a separate meeting. I think it's a great idea so that all faculty members--and just faculty members--can get together and decide what their role is in this system. But as you do get together and come up with these ideas and you do make plans, and you do narrow out the issues, and you do come up with solutions, then you must have a way of evaluating whether that solution is any good or not.

I'll close with my final hang-up on educators--that is they don't like to be evaluated. Nobody does. Nobody likes to have somebody say, "Did I do a good job or didn't I do a good job; did I really produce for my clients, the students." In my business, there are 2000 lawyers in Denver so if they don't like me, they can just go down the street; there's another lawyer, he'll probably charge less. You've got to come up with a system so that the general public feels that you really are concerned about providing good services to the students. I really don't think you want the legislature to get involved except as a last resort, that you really should resolve things yourselves.

Closing Remarks

-JOHN C. MUNDT

CLOSING REMARKS
by John C. Mundt

My first overriding impression, despite all the arguments and disagreements, is that everyone is glad he or she is here. There is a unanimous feeling that the conference was necessary and helpful.

My second impression is an expressed concern that, while the symposium was needed, there are no concrete results. It was not held for that purpose. There was no secret model somebody was going to impose on somebody else. It is now evident there were no hidden agendas. This was an open conference. But, I think people do want further steps and the question is, what should they be? I'll come to that in a minute.

The third impression is a state board/state staff impression. We thought we had set up some communication structures: the conferences going on regarding the statewide salary schedule, the policy development groups that worked on student activity fees and athletics, the Legislative Council, the Six-year Plan, this governance symposium, and the establishment of state staff positions at the request of system constituencies. But these are not working as well as we thought. I think you will agree we have tried. We must now make these--and other procedures--work better.

I do think the conference has improved understanding between constituencies--at least for the people here.

The fourth impression involves that intangible and elusive factor called trust. All of the outside resource people spotted this: Dr. Richardson noted the "unwillingness to credit other fellows with honorable intentions." Professor Frankie talked of the need for "tension-reducing mechanisms." Alan Shark referred to campuses as "experimental centers for faith," and Senator Shoemaker warned of the impression that family fights have on legislators.

What can we do from this point on? We should give consideration to three things: a Phase II conference this fall; an effort to take steps to define the relationships between district-level and state-level responsibilities; and perhaps undertake some similar activity at the district or campus level. I am not going to address the latter. There is great and desirable diversity at the local level. That is a local matter and should be handled locally.

In discussing a Phase II conference, I want to refer to Bill Munz' question about the faculty resolution. I want to propose a little different idea; an all-system annual meeting. There could be separate sessions for faculty and students, etc., as we did here. But there could also be four or five panels or meetings on topics of common concern. So let us consider a follow-up Phase II conference.

A lot of you, if I hear you right, would not want to see the interest and enthusiasm of this symposium die. We need some mechanism for giving continuing attention to important subjects. I would hope that Alan Shark's and Bob Hamill's plan and the suggestion of others that the question of governance be given continuing attention can be heeded. We would be open to suggestions. As I said at the outset--we did not come to the conference with any particular proposal or model.

In regard to state-level/district-level responsibilities, I want to assure you that I will provide leadership in grappling with that question. This is a solvable subject--we should retain a high level of local responsibility and have sufficient unity as a system to deal with the executive and legislative branches. It obviously calls for some sort of balance--with mutual understanding of what is necessary.

CONCLUSION

The questions we have raised regarding collective bargaining, governance, responsibility and relationships are difficult problems.

For example, how can you go hammer and tongs all morning in a collective bargaining session and then at 2:00 in the afternoon meet in another room and talk about the goals and objectives of the district or system in the Six-year Plan?

We must constantly shift gears. This requires very mature people and a high degree of tolerance and patience. It also requires a broad knowledge of the facts--like the immense impact of third party agencies on everything we do. Very little was said about that in this conference and yet at the state board level we must deal with it constantly.

I think we can meet the challenge if we try to maintain our professional relationships; if we are sufficiently determined that mutual respect and trust must be preserved; if we apply a relaxed approach in our inter-personal relationships; and, if we keep our sense of humor.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

DEC 13 19[illegible]

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION